

बुद्धीय पुस्तकालय

वनस्थली विद्यापीठ

श्रेणी संख्या 954.032
पुस्तक संख्या B17W
अवाप्ति क्रमांक ✓ 2882

World War
And Its Only Cure—
World Order And World Religion.

By

BHAGAVAN DAS, M.A., D.LITT.,
(hon. *causa*, Benares and Allahabad Universities),
~~ex~~-M.L.A. (Central, of India).

BENARES, 1941. College Section

Publisher:—DR. BHAGAVAN DAS,

BENARES (CANTT:)

Rs. 2/4/- ; 3s. 6d.

There is no copy-right in this book.

Printed by Shri Rameshwar Pathak,
at the Tara Printing Works, Benares.

CONTENTS. No. 2882

ix
xix
xv
xvi
xvii

Memorable Words.
Apologia.
Prayer.
Dedication.

Introductory Foreword.

Chapter I. Present State of the Human World.	1
The 'Practicality' of World-Rulers, including the British Government of India.	1
Why not Organise for Peace rather than War ?	6
Christian Churches and Army Commanders.	6
Disastrous Corruptions of Home, Church, State, Trade, and Science.	10
Perpetual Strife between Altruism and Egoism, Go (o) d and D-Evil.	11
The 'Practicality' of the I.N. Congress.	12
Suggestions which arise in this Setting.	12
Chapter II. The First Suggestion—to the British Government of India.	13
The First Suggestion (of this book)—to the British Government—"Declare Dominion Status for India, now, at once, (with certain Conditions)".	14
The Great Advantages of doing so; Pressure on Hitler; Hitler's Promise.	15
World Opinion and India.	17
America and the World War.	18
"We have all sinned".	19
The Poison of Imperialism.	19
The widespread Demand, in Britain itself, for a Declaration of War-and-Peace Aims, with reference to a 'New World Order'.	21
British Opinion re' India and China.	22
The Views of the I.N. Congress on Imperialism and Fascism-Nazism.	22
Britain's Reaction to the Wardha Statement d/- 10-9-1939.	24
The One Great Lack in the Congress Leadership.	25
Mere Protestations and Promises are of no use.	26
Arithmetical Devices, of <i>proportionate</i> representation, futile, nay, worse.	28
What a Good and Wise Government can and should do.	29
A Letter from 9 M.P.'s to the Indian People.	31
Give Guarantees Now, of a 'New World Order', and so end the current War, at once.	33
Leading British Politicians' Views, to the same effect.	34
A Theosophical Prophecy.	35
An English-edited Indian Daily's view in favor of Immediate Declaration of Dominion Status for India.	36
British Women's Support.	38

Chapter III. Preliminaries for the Second Suggestion.	39
Failures all round—Why ?	39
Lack of a Rational World Order, and Excessive Greed, Lust, Hate.	40
The New phrase—A 'New World Order'.	40
H.G. Wells' views and other British Opinions.	45
'The Monstrous Evil of Un-employment': Its chief cause, the	46
more Monstrous Evil of Mis-employment for War purposes.	46
Indian Repercussions of the Idea of a New World Order.	50
Native-and-Foreigner or Fellow-Human ?	51
Skin-Color or Heart-Quality ?	52
Chapter IV. What are 'Freedom', 'a Better World', 'Swaraj' ?	53
Deceitful Words and Ways of Rulers.	53
Some Restriction of Freedom inevitable in Social Life.	55
Form of Society distinct from Form of Government.	58
Dangers of mis-understood 'Swa-raj'.	58
A Vicious Circle and its Solution.	60
The Crux in Political Science and Art, and its Solution.	60
Arche-type and Sub-types	61
Universal Self and Individual Self ; 'We' and 'I'.	62
Each for All and All for Each.	64
No Way Out, except by World Organisation.	66
Chapter V. The Great-World Need : (a) a Model Social Organisation, and (b) a Common Core-Religion.	68
The World Mind moving towards a World Religion.	69
Inter-dependence of World Order and World Religion ; the 3 Objects of the Theosophical Society, the long vistas of upward Human Evolution shown by them.	70
A word of Caution.	78
The Painful Progress of Humanity.	78
How it can be quickened and made less painful—by Right Education.	74
How only can World Synthesis be achieved.	76
Vicious Education and Vicious Literature, the Consequence ; the Remedy.	79
The Hindn-Muslim Problem of India, its artificial Exacerbation.	81
Balancing of Power, and of Powers.	82
The Gratitude and the Promises of Politicians.	83
"Thy Sins shall find thee out."	84
The British-German Problem ; the Duel of the Titans.	85
The Grinding of the Face of the Peoples.	89
Vast Economic Drain and Waste of Human Labor.	90
The Urgent Need of Agreement, in Europe and in India.	92
Dr. Annie Besant's Prophecy, in 1917.	93
Merits and Demerits—on Each Side.	94
'All is fair in Love and War'. 'War has no room for Scruples'—the dietum of Lord Kitchener ; followed by all the belligerents.	97
The Real Cause of the Present War—Colonies.	99
'Emergency Socialism'.	105
Lord Londonderry and Other British and U.S. American Writers on the Case for and against Germany.	107

The Men of Wisdom constitute His Head ;
 The Men of Valorous Action are His Arms ;
 The storing, giving, and All-Nourishing
 Men of acquisitive Desire—His Trunk ;
 And Men of Labor—All-supporting Legs.
 Thus are All Human Beings parts of One Whole.)

Bani Ādam, ā'zā-e yak-ḍigar and,
 Ke ḍar āfrīnīsh ze Yak Jauhar and. (Sādī).
 (The Progeny of Adam are as limbs,
 Members and organs of one and the same
 Great Organism ; since they all have come
 From the Same Single Source of Life and Light)

Rājā prajānām hṛdayam garīyah,
 Prajāsh-cha rājño-a-pratīmam sharīram. (*Mahā-bhārata*).
 Ra'iyat cho bēkh, o malik chūn ḍaraḥt,
 Bilā shak ḍaraḥt ast az bēkh saḥt. (Sādī).
 Shad-bhāga-bhṛtyā dāsyātvē
 Prajābhis-tu nīpah kṛtāh. (*Shukra-nīti*).
 (Where'er the king is as the People's heart ;
 The People, as the body, of that heart ;
 Where King and People are as trunk and root ;
 Where the King knows he is a salaried Servant,
 Paid by the People in the shape of taxes ;
 Where Public Servant and the Public, both,
 Have but one Common Aim and Interest,
 The General Welfare, ever Fuller Life
 For all—there only reigns Prosperity.)

APOLOGIA

If any 'practical' man sneers at me, and tells me that you cannot run the world on the basis of 'sentimental idealism', then I appeal to 'practical' experience, and ask him to look at the actual results of trying to run the world on some other basis. There is War from end to end of the Earth. What further proof does the 'practical' man require? (Sir Richard Acland, M.P.). There can be no peace in all the world now, but a Common Peace, no prosperity but a Common Prosperity. Wells has told you this; and many others have told you this; but it seems that somehow you don't wish to see. You appear to prefer the claptrap of nationalism, your separatisms, your petty jealousies and your patriotic vanities, to that creative life of peace and happiness and plenty that is there, within our grasp, if only we could unite with our fellowmen throughout the world. We cannot get it by standing alone. We can get it only by union. I am not the first person to tell you this; nor will I be the last. But I had to say it, and to say it in this way. I have tried not to be offensive, but it may be that, here and there, my feelings have got the better of me. When that has happened, I pray and hope you will forgive me. In the last resort, a Sincerely Organised World Order will depend upon a Public Opinion that insists upon it and supports it, because it understands *why* it is necessary. (W. B. Curry.)

PRAYER

May the One Source of Universal Life and Consciousness, may the Principle of Unity and Love and Light, take pity on Mankind, be merciful to them, pardon their grievous sins, restore Sanity and give Wisdom to the rulers and the leaders of Humanity, and send to the Human Race, Peace and surcease of its war-torments, with the advent of the New Year (1942) of the era of the Christ, the Man of Sorrows and of Peace.

This work is
DEDICATED

to

ALL WHO SINCERELY AND EARNESTLY BELIEVE

that

A BRITISH-INDIAN COMMONWEALTH
OF GENUINE EQUAL PARTNERSHIP

is

The Most Practicable,

THE BEST, THE SUREST, AND THE STRONGEST

FOUNDATION

for

A NEW WORLD ORDER
INSPIRED AND PERVADED BY
A WORLD RELIGION.

CORRIGENDA.

The writer regrets the large number of misprints in the book. The more important are corrected below :

P.	L.	For	Read
xxi	5	prespect	respect
14	3 from bottom	Statue	Statute
14	"	Westminister	Westminster, and that, henceforth, 'the British Em- pire' shall be called 'the British- Indian Common- wealth';
17	2	agreements	arguments
21	30	supply	apply
27	24	on 3-9-1939	of 3-9-1939
37	13	war ended	war is ended
44	6	immediately	intensely
45	2	he	Mr. Wells
63	5 from bottom	Impersonal	Impersonal,
82	last line	H. Laski	C. E. M. Joad
93	15	Annie	Annie Besant's
98	11 from bottom	race' to	race' is to
119	15	Capitalism,	Capitalism, Dictatorism and Communism,
125	25	Kropothin	Kropotkin
127	1	note	mote
141	14	Nietzsche	Treitschke
173	22	first and	first, and
175	last line	old books.	ancient books, in sup- port of this view.
186	20	property	properly
190	18	successful.	successful. ¹

190	22	problem ¹	problem
202	13	They	The Muslims
206	20	commuad	command
237	3	'spheres	into 'spheres
"	4	'mandates	by 'mandates
241	11	out	out that
247	16	Westminster	and that, hence- forth, 'the British Empire' shall be called 'the British- Indian Common- wealth';
257	15	endeavour,	endeavour, even though only as part of her war against Italy,
260	5	their	there
368	9 from bottom	very	every
279	7	He	Mahatma-ji
391	5 from bottom	hardy	handy

INTRODUCTORY FOREWORD.

A series of articles by the present writer were published in the *Leuder* (Allahabad), and some other dailies, in the last three months of 1940. Some friends wished them reprinted in pamphlet form. This rather large book is the result. It retains its original nature, of newspaper articles and paragraphs, commenting on current events; but the comments have, all of them, a single purpose. If it is read as a collection of such articles, a few pages at a time, the reader will probably not be repelled by the frequent repetitions of the same ideas. Newspaper articles are always repeating the same things over and over again; when they are endeavouring to support some particular policy or measure, to propagate some special view, to rally public opinion in favor of some movement. It has even been said that 'Repetition is the soul of journalism'. All education is repetition; all the daily routine of life is repetition; indeed, the whole World-Process is an infinite cyclical repetition. But there is a perpetual variation also, side by side with repetition.

This book too, through such repetitions along with variations, seeks to promote an Object, which gives to it whatever unity, continuity, consistency it may have. Otherwise, it would be only a loose collection of rambling notes and paras, like 'Memoirs' or 'Journals', or a very large 'topical pamphlet', talking about the World War and the Indian Political Struggle and Communal Conflict. The reader will find many discursions on Psychological and Metaphysical principles. The writer begs him not to hastily brush them aside as irrelevant verbiage. It is these Principles, and their due application to the administration of human affairs, which constitute whatever of permanent interest the book may be deemed to have; the rest is only 'topical', and therefore of temporary interest; for even a World War, *apart from its lessons*, is of only passing interest, comparatively; though that interest may be terribly acute. It is these principles which provide the foundation for the Object of this book, and, to this writer's mind, constitute the *lessons* of the War.

That Object is clearly indicated by the Title of the book, the Dedication, the heading of every page; and page 2nd

page indicates it, more or less specifically. The whole book endeavours to lead up to it, over and over again, along various lines of argument, with illustrations drawn from current events and recent history. It endeavours to enlist the reader's active help in promoting that Object, viz., the widest possible dissemination of the Idea, that the only Remedy, for these recurring mad butcheries called World Wars, and these endemic insane riots called Communal Conflicts, is a Rational World Order, based on, inspired and pervaded by, a Rational World Religion. It shows, by scores of quotations, that the best and most humanitarian minds of many countries, and their numerous followers, ever growing in number, are now turning towards this same conclusion. It also lays the greatest possible stress upon the fact that the best and surest as well as the most practicable and 'practical' foundation for such World Order is a genuine British-Indian Commonwealth. The *principles* of such World Order, as indicated by Indian traditions, are referred to, on page after page, throughout the book, and are stated more fully and specifically in chs. XIII and XIV. They are expounded at greater length in the writer's other works, of which this may be regarded as a supplement and continuation.

It has been very rightly observed that 'Ideas move the world', 'Ideas have hands and feet'; 'Ideas realise themselves'; 'Ideals gradually become Reals'. The profoundest thinkers and teachers of humanity have held that the World-Process is the Ideation, the Will-and-Imagination, of God. All the wonders of Science and Civilisation, smallest to greatest, are human 'Ideas' which have become 'mater-ialised'. These wonders are male-ficent, if the Ideas behind them are malevolent and wrong; or bene-ficent, if the Ideas are benevolent and right. Therefore, the spread of *Right* Ideas is the first, most important, most indispensable step of Re-form. Any Right Idea which firmly 'possesses', any Wrong Idea which strongly 'obsesses', even a single mind, tends to realise itself through action; much more strongly and rapidly does it realise itself, when it 'possesses', or 'obsesses', the 'Public Mind'. Hence, 'propaganda', i.e., repetition in many ways, is always resorted to by all who are impelled by an Idea. Hence, too, the necessity to counteract, to fight against, Wrong Propaganda with Right Propaganda. Who shall decide which is Right and which is Wrong? Ultimately, the same Public Mind, Collective Intelligence, Public Opinion—before which,

'both sides of the question' have been placed diligently, by the ablest spokesmen and advocates of each side.

With advancing age, this writer has shed, more and more, all conceit of superior cleverness of his own intelligence; he fervently hopes that he has none left now; and he has therefore sought support, more and more, from the writings of others, old and new writers of note, for the Ideas which appeared to him to be right and helpful. The old and growingly feeble man has to lean on others for support. Especially in this book, which, perforce, has a somewhat controversial character, he has gathered the far better language of others, who were and are much more qualified to form judgments on such matters, for the expression of thoughts that appeared to him to be true.

'Judge not, lest ye be judged'—in the self-righteous, self-important, cavilling, fault-finding spirit. But, for the service of others, even a very insignificant person may justifiably endeavour to decide which is the best course; and, incidentally, to judge whether the courses followed by others, which have a very disturbing effect on his and his neighbour's, his countrymen's, and all his fellow-beings' lives, are right or wrong. For so judging, he may well seek and gather the views, on the problem before him, of those who are abler and better situated to judge correctly.

Therefore, in venturing to form and express opinions, (in order to secure for them the support of Public Opinion), on the doings and thinkings of the 'Great Powers', and of the 'great men in great power', which doings and thinkings are the direct or indirect cause of the agony of body and mind into which the whole world has been plunged again, this writer has diligently collected the views of others, particularly of British writers, for all matters relating to countries other than India. For Indian affairs and happenings he has gathered the views of other Indians, but has also relied on his own experience and observations. He has endeavoured his best to describe and appraise impartially the merits as well as the demerits of all the countries, (Britain, Germany, Italy, France, Russia, U.S.A., etc.) and their leaders, (Chamberlain, Churchill, Hitler, Mussolini, Daladier, Petain, Stalin, Roosevelt, etc.) which, and who, have been, and are, actively concerned with the promotion and conduction of these world-ruining Political Wars; and he has done so with the help of British writings, very largely.

Of the three Ideologies, which divide the 'civilised' World between them to-day, and have flung all that world, as well as the 'less civilised' and 'uncivilised' world, into terrible turmoil ; viz., (1) Democracy, (2) Fascism-Nazism, (3) Communism-Socialism ; he has endeavoured to indicate the radical errors which vitiate all three ; indicate in the light of the traditional Indian Science of Human Nature ; the errors, respectively, of (1) Imperialism, Mammonism, and Nationalism, (2) Racism, Imperialism, and Nationalism, (3) Excessive and therefore impossible Equalitarianism, Super-State-Capitalism, Anti-Religionism, and now, also Nationalism, and land-annexing Militarism, and a bizarre Individualist-Capitalism, which permits writers of farces to amass millions of roubles and invest them in Govt. 6 p.c.'s, while millions of peasants cannot have all the 'necessaries' they require. He has also essayed to show the yet more radical error behind all these, viz., Extremism, by the pruning off of which, in accordance with the traditional Indian Science of Human Nature and Principles of Social Organisation, all these, now bitterly antagonistic, 'isms' can be reconciled, synthesised, and improved into Rational Humanist Individuo-Socialism.

A war necessarily forces Governments, and the Peoples 'governed' by them, to concentrate on the 'immediate needs' of the 'present'. But the 'future needs' deserve even greater attention. If the 'future' were duly attended to, such 'presents' would become very rare. We live too much in the present, 'eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we die', 'make hay while the sun shines', are too inert to think deeply about the future, 'the before *and* the after' which arises out of the 'before' ; and, therefore, we cannot make merry for very long, for we are dying, not tomorrow, but today ; cannot make much hay, for we ourselves send up the clouds of war to blot out the sun, and prevent it from shining on us, by neglecting to think sufficiently far about the future as well as the present.

In dealing with India's Political Struggle with the British Government, and with her Communal Conflicts which are practically the sole obstacle now to the success of that Struggle, this writer has been compelled to dwell most reluctantly, upon the weak points in the policy, the methods, the work, of the Congress : and, herein, that which has caused him most repugnance has been the expression of views which may look like 'criticism' and 'contradiction' of Mahatma Gandhi's view.

In referring to the weaknesses of Congress workers, he has repeatedly stated that, as a whole, the personnel of the Congress, rank for rank, grade for grade, is even obviously of a higher ethical quality than the personnel of the British-Indian Bureaucracy, in prospect of self-sacrifice; and, so far as the most honored leaders of the Congress are concerned, incomparably higher; but he has felt it his duty also to state, all the same, that that personnel has shown weaknesses, which have been deplored and even reprimanded publicly now and then, by Mahatma Gandhi and Pt. Jawaharlal themselves; shown them particularly during the period that the Congress was in office; which weaknesses have greatly hampered the work of the Congress Ministries, and lost to the Congress much of the prestige that it had rightly acquired, by its sacrifices, in the eyes of the public, and even of the bureaucracy. This writer felt that the 'odium' of such work could be most usefully undertaken by persons who were themselves members of the Congress, and have been endeavouring to serve it to the best of their small ability, as this writer has been; for blame by opponents would naturally be thought to be prejudiced.

As regards expressions of dissent from Mahatma-ji, feeling, as he does, the profoundest respect for Mahatma Gandhi's saintly personality, he has found this part of the work the most distasteful. Also, the writer fears that he has thereby caused hurt to some very worthy and dear friends. He has tried carefully to find out whether there were any good and sufficient reasons for their feeling deeply hurt; he has failed to. A passing annoyance, he can understand; but real lasting hurt, he cannot, when the object of both is the better service of the work of the Congress. The mere fact, however, that they did feel hurt, is enough to cause him great regret and to make him beg their pardon here. On the other hand, he has been told by other good friends, equally worthy, equally good, prominent, and even leading workers of the Congress, that some persons must do this distasteful work, (though they themselves could not do it, as they admitted, because they were so circumstanced, by juniority in years, or the bearing of some office in the Congress organisation, or otherwise), of publicly pointing out the lacks in the Congress activities; for otherwise the defects would never be cured. And to merely mention the lacks, without reference, by name, to the views and instructions given out by

the greatest leader of the whole movement, was scarcely possible, and would have been far more ineffective than it has been even with such reference. The events of history can scarcely be described and discussed without mention of the makers of history. And Mahatma-ji has been and is the greatest of the political leaders and history-makers, during the last two decades, whom India has produced. The history of India, since 1919, is all written round his name. He has poured new life into the Congress, new fearlessness, new self-respect, new self-denial, new spirit of sacrifice for the sake of the country, new striving after Truth and Non-Violence, into the Body and Soul of the Indian People. Many reform movements, of very long standing, which were stagnating, or advancing very languidly, the Swadeshi movement, the Women's, the New Literature, the Anti-Untouchability, the Inter-caste Marriage, the Educational Reform, etc., movements, (see pp. 327-328 *infra*), have all received a new and great impetus, from this new vitality which he has given to the People, directly or indirectly, by precept and even more by splendid example. If it seems, to any individual member of that People, that the progress of the good work may be helped, that it may be saved from going astray, by pointing out to the leaders a danger to be avoided; that individual may surely be pardoned for doing so, even if he does it in a clumsy manner. Passenger trains have been saved from plunging into an abyss and being wrecked, because a villager happened to be present near by when a culvert was washed away by a flood, immediately before the train was due, and hung up a red loin-cloth—having nothing better about him—across the rails, on hastily fixed pieces of bamboo. Such a villager deserves to be at least pardoned for not doing better, if he cannot be rewarded for doing what he did!

In any case, this writer has the consolation, even the encouragement, of feeling sure that Mahatma-ji will not suspect him of any wrong motive, even though he may have become guilty, unwittingly, in the heat of argument, of language savouring of discourtesy, or of any lack of that profound respect which he harbours constantly for Mahatma-ji's saintliness; for his ascetic intensity of will, his marvellously tireless labors for the uplift of the country, his command over his body and his compelling of it to obey his mind always; and for his astonishing economy of time, whereby he gets through endless interviews, visitors, corres-

pondence, writings for his weekly *Harijan*, meetings of committees, and informal and formal conferences and consultations with other leaders ; and, over and above all this, attends to sick patients, and looks after the details of the lives of the inmates of his Âshrama. This writer therefore feels sure that Mahatma-ji will not doubt his motive, whatever the differences of opinion, on matters of public interest, honestly held and expressed.

Finally, it is a source of great joy to this writer, that even the chief difference of opinion, as to the desirability of getting a Constitution tentatively drafted, and placed before the public, for discussion and for the education of public opinion, while the other work of the Congress is being carried on as usual—this difference too has now been removed, by the letters from Mahatma-ji, which are published on the last pages of this book.

As regards his criticisms of the policies and ways of the British Government, the fact that page after page of the book stresses the urgent need for the earliest possible establishment of a genuine *British-Indian* Commonwealth, is enough proof that, instead of harboring any ill-will towards Britain, he wants the connection between Britain and India to become permanent, and that he *wishes well* to the British People *as much as* he does to the Indian People. No person, at all reasonable, can expect him to do anything more or else than this.

As regards his criticisms of those 'communalistic' (—not 'communistic', the same word in root, but very different now in meaning—) Hindu and Muslim leaders, who would make of Hindus and Muslims two entirely different species of bipeds, two 'nations', this writer has felt his conscience clear in pointing out the faults of both, impartially ; because he loves Vedanta and Sūfism equally ; and deplores the superstitions, and corruptions by priestcraft, of both Hinduism and Muslimism, equally. He has pointed out the seriously blameworthy faults of current Hinduism and its leaders, 'more insistently and more freely than those of current Muslimism and its leaders, because he happens to have been born a 'Hindu', and continues to bear that designation, and because he is more familiar, therefore, with the reprehensible deficiencies of Hinduism as practised today.

Another source of great satisfaction to this writer, (besides the one derived from Mahatma-ji's letters), and to the vast majority of the Indian People, presumably, (as indicating the

beginning of a 'change of heart' in the British Government), is that all the imprisoned leaders of the Congress have also now been released, by this time. Though it is true, in one sense, that, as some of them have said after release, this, by itself, is not 'good news' and not matter for rejoicing ; yet it is good, in another sense, inasmuch as they will have a chance of conferring together, of taking stock of the whole situation, newly, in view of the 'progress', or 'regress', of world-events since their incarceration, and of deciding on what change of policy and programme is now needed, if at all ; and they will, in any case, have the chance of forming a considered opinion on the proposal which Mahatma-ji will place before them, in accordance with his letters above mentioned. Other news of the week is that the armies of Britain and Germany in North Africa, of Russia and Germany in western Russia, and the navies of Britain and the U. S. A., and Germany and Japan, on all the oceans, are continuing to 'hold up', and reel to and fro in mighty grapple with, each other ; under the dispensation of the Great Mystery, which seems to have willed that they shall continue to do so, (the leaders of all the belligerent nations are speaking of the continuance of the war in 1942, 1943, and more, and are planning measures accordingly), until, exhausted, the War Madness passes out of all their heads, simultaneously, and makes way for the coming into those heads, of the Sanity and Joy of Peace.

In political controversies, and debates over executive and administrative questions generally, the argument most frequently employed by persons in office, or by any others whose vested interests are endangered ; the retort thought to be the most crushingly conclusive ; is that the opponent is 'unpractical', an 'impossible idealist', while the arguer himself is exceedingly 'practical'. The book opens, therefore, with a brief description of the consequences of the 'practicality' of the men in power, the men in office, the great statesmen and rulers and finance-kings of the world.

Benares, 7-12-1941.

Bhagavan Das.

CHAPTER I*

The Present State of the Human World.

(1) In the first week of December, 1940, as reported by the dailies, Britain's average war expenditure was nearly sixteen million pounds *per day*. At this rate, making a rough estimate for all the countries at war, certainly thirty, probably thirty-five, million pounds, (forty to fifty crores of rupees), worth of human labor is being sent up, *every day*, at present, in Europe and east Asia and north Africa, in the form of appalling 'fireworks', from earth to heaven; destruction of human life and human works is raining from heaven in return, to make a hell of earth; millions of tons of shipping, and thousands upon thousands of men, women, and children, have been and are being sunk beneath the sea, and murdered on land; all the normal flow of life has been broken up utterly, and changed into a flood of misery, for half the human population of the earth's surface; the Demoniatic Madness is slowly and steadily stretching its awful spectral talons over the other half. Every nation is ferociously hating, vilifying, blackguarding, endeavouring to ruin and exterminate or enslave, every other; every government proclaims that it is fighting for 'Freedom', for 'Humanity', for 'Justice', for 'Peace'; every government, every politician, is appealing for unity and for discipline, but only within its or his or her own nation, party, ranks, and as *against* every other. Such is the result of the functioning of the super-brains of those countries. Is it all very 'practical'?

The 'Practicality' of the World Rulers.

The rulers and politicians, the 'great ones of the earth', who are twirling the wretched human world around their little fingers—will they condescend to ponder for a moment, whether it is all very 'practical'? Do they not all cry down 'ideality'? Do they not all pique themselves on their 'practicality'?

* This book is a revised and enlarged reprint of a series of articles which were published in the *Leader* (Allahabad) and some other Indian dailies, on 6.10.1940, 6.11.1940, and 18 to 26.12.1940. Additional matter has been put into foot-notes and appendices also.

It is announced from time to time that the best scientific brains are engaged in the task of discovering devices for counteracting the wicked inventions of the scientists of the enemy-country, and expediting its defeat. Early in the War, a British Cabinet Minister stated that eight hundred scientists were engaged in such work. France had probably as many. Germany, very likely, has twice that number; to say nothing of Italy. Is it a very 'practical' use of science? Would it be wholly 'un-practical' if these best scientific brains, of all the countries, were brought together, in a Benevolent Conference, (instead of the futile Disarmament and Economic Conferences of politicians), for thinking out a Scheme of a 'New World Order,' whereby the human life, labor, resources, that are now being so woefully misemployed and wasted, would be wisely employed, to ensure (—as they surely could, *if* thus wisely employed—) food, clothing, shelter, work, family-life, comfort in place of misery, to all? O! what lawful and refined happiness, for all Humanity, could not be secured, if all this thirty-five million pounds worth of human labor were scientifically and wisely spent, *every day*, on cultivating the earth and beautifying her, and milking her of her inexhaustible mineral and vegetable treasures. Is it very 'un-practical' to appeal for the Unity and Discipline of *all* classes, ranks, parties, nations, peoples, and *for* (instead of *against*) each other?

The following quotations from a recent book, by a Member of the British Parliament, will show how thoughtful and humanitarian minds are working in the same way, in Europe also. Many others are writing to the same effect.

"If any 'practical' man sneers at me, and tells me that you cannot run the world on the basis of 'sentimental' idealism,' then I appeal to the one thing the 'practical' man is supposed to respect. I appeal to 'practical' experience, and ask him to look at the actual results of trying to run the world on some other basis. There is war from end to end of the earth. What further proof does the 'practical' man require?"... "*What are we fighting for?* How can we possibly gain by killing each other? There is more than enough in this world for all of us, if peoples will only treat each other as brothers. In heaven's name, why can't we *co-operate* for prosperity?"... "Take courage. Reject the taunts of those who will tell you that you are diverting the nation from its war-effort. You will be doing nothing of the sort.

You will be taking the only course which can offer you and your people escape from war, and success in peace".¹

Of course, *mere* 'sentimental idealism', *merely* the Golden Rule of Christ, will not run the world, by itself. It has to be *provided with a technique*; it has to be worked amidst the *setting of a Rational World Order*. Then it will work splendidly, unfailingly. The Ancient Indian Social Organisation or Individuo-Socialism claims to provide such a setting. Sir Richard Acland makes some general suggestions of his own in this behalf, but wisely and very naturally observes that "some appropriate body" should deliberate over and decide upon this vitally important matter. So also do all other reasonable thinkers. He says: "Consider, at first, *without reference to immediate war problems, how the countries of the world might be organised, both internally and in their relations to each other*" (externally)¹. The Ancient Indian Individuo-Socialism claims to show *how*.²

The 'Practicality' of the British Government of India.

The present Viceroy of India, Lord Linlithgow, in the course of his inaugural address to the joint session of the Indian Science Congress and the British Association of Science in Calcutta, in January, 1938, said: "Even the most enthusiastic believer in Western Civilisation must feel, today, a certain despondency, at the apparent failure of the West, to dominate scientific discoveries, and to *evolve a form of Society*", (in other words, a 'New World Order'), "in which material progress and spiritual freedom march comfortably together. *Perhaps the West will find, in India's more general emphasis on simplicity and the ultimate spirituality of things, a more positive example of the truths which the most advanced minds of the west are now discovering. Is it too much to hope that you, gentlemen, will be a channel through which India will make, in an increasing degree, that contribution to western and to world thought, which those of us who know and love India, are confident that she can make in so full a degree?*"

¹Sir Richard Acland, M. P., *Unser Kampf* (Our Struggle), pp. 52, 154, 159, 160, and 94.

²See Appendix C, 'Principles of Social Organisation'. See also Appendix A, 'An Appeal to the Scientists of the World'.

All this could scarcely have been said only superficially, only for show purposes, for the occasion. It would not be seemly, not be right, for a person occupying the high office of Viceroy, to speak thus, to an assemblage of great scientists. Let us therefore believe that he spoke sincerely. But, then, the question arises : What active 'practical' encouragement have these scientific gentlemen received from persons in the highest political authority, like Lord Linlithgow, in India, and like the Cabinet Ministers in Britain, to "evolve (such) a (finer) form of Society"? In Europe, in every country, the scientists have been and are being made, and, most short-sightedly and weakly have allowed themselves to be made, the tools of murderous war, instead. And India has nearly lost her soul, (a far greater loss than any of her material losses); and, committing many blunders in the process, she is trying to recover that soul, far more important than the amenities of 'civilised' life and access to the stores of physical science, which she has received from the west. Japan has received the same too. But because of her inherent virtues of internal solidarity and capacity for self-denial, she did not allow herself to be subjected to political domination by the west. Hence she has prospered exceedingly, and with astounding rapidity. But, most unhappily, that very excess of speed and prosperity has turned her head and led her astray, and she has taken over, not only the great virtues, but also the great vices, of the west.

The Indian People have become growingly demoralised, despiritualised, over-pauperised, over-populated with human beings weak in body, character, and mind; owing, primarily, no doubt, to the ignorance, the short-sighted excessive selfishnesses and personal ambitions, the vices, of her religious and political leaders and rulers, in the preceding regimes; but owing also, secondarily, to very serious defects in, and neglect of several vitally important 'promotive' duties and 'ministrant' functions, by the current form of Administration; and to the continued privation of rational self-government, and, consequently, of stimulus and of freedom to the people, to recover their physical, moral, and intellectual health, and develop the material resources of their country afresh.

Sir S. Radhakrishnan's comment on the above utterance of Lord Linlithgow, is this: "If, before it is too late, India's legitimate hopes and just aspirations receive their fulfilment, her influence on the British Commonwealth, and the world

at large, will be exerted towards the developement of a higher quality of life in the individual, and the establishment of a 'World Commonwealth,' (in other words, a 'New World Order'), "based on the ideals of spirit...The coming together of two great civilisations, not so widely separated in some of the main sources of their strength, has caused some spiritual discords, political tragedy, and personal agony. It has, however, *unrivalled opportunities for the shaping of the future*".¹

Why not 'Organise for Peace', rather than for War?

If each country 'organises for peace,' systematically, *within* its own borders; for peace between all sections and vocations of its own people; it will automatically become wholly unnecessary for any country to 'organise for war' against any other. A natural Co-operation and Federation, of all countries, would be the inevitable result of the successful *internal* organisation for *peace*, of each; and any sporadic marauder, seized with a fit of madness, would be readily and easily punished and put in chains by the joint forces of the Federation. 'Moral equivalents for War', to duly exercise the egoistic combative and self-assertive instincts of human beings, would be found in abundance, which would utilise them for good and useful altruistic social purposes.

This idea, of the systematic Organisation for Peace, of each society and all societies, in other words, of the whole Human Race (Skt., *Mānava-samājā-vyavasthā*; Ar-Per., *tan-zīm-i-jamā'a-t-i-banī-Ādam*), is now beginning to pervade the Mass-mind, or Public Opinion, under the new name of a 'New World Order.' The phrase has been coming into use after the previous World War. The New World War has given a very great impetus to the idea; and the phrase, a 'New World Order', or some equivalent, 'a New Form of Society', 'a Better World', 'a Better Social Structure', 'a World Reconstruction', 'a World Federation', 'a World Commonwealth,' meets the eye in almost every day's paper, in some column or other. It is very surprising that, while the word 'Commonwealth' is rightly loved by every Englishman, as it should be, in its true sense, by every human being; the word 'Communism', which, etymologically, means

¹In his latest book, *Eastern Religions and Western Thought*, (p. 305), a very fine work altogether.

exactly the same thing, (though perhaps *less* expressly), is hated by British statesmen and the wealthier and more aristocratic classes of Britain. The reason is, of course, that the word 'Common-wealth' has been diverted away from its proper etymological meaning, and invested with an artificial one; as also has been the word 'Communism', in another direction.

**The Christian Churches also recognise the need
for a New World Order.**

Even the Churches of the West have now begun to speak of a New World Order as needed. The dailies have reported, (London, 21-12-1940), that "The Anglican Church and the Free Churches have accepted His Holiness the Pope's 'five Peace Points'. The heads of the Churches state their acceptance in a letter to the *Times* signed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council, and the Archbishop of Westminster, the head of the Roman Catholic Church in great Britain.

"The five points, which were first issued in an address to the College of Cardinals on Christmas eve last year, are:

- "1. The right of all nations to independent existence;
2. Disarmament; 3. Some juridical institution to guarantee, and, when necessary, revise and correct international agreements; 4. Adjustment, as required, of just demands of nations' populations and minorities; 5. The peoples and rulers to be guided by *universal love*.

"To these basic principles, the letter adds five:

- "1. *Extreme inequality in wealth should be abolished*;
2. *equal educational opportunities* for every child; 3. the *family* as a *social unit* must be safeguarded; 4. the sense of *divine vocation* must be restored to man's daily work;
5. *the resources of the earth* should be used for the *whole human race*.

"The signatories are confident, says the letter, that the principles they have enumerated, would be accepted by rulers and statesmen throughout the British Commonwealth of Nations, and would be regarded as a true basis on which lasting peace could be stabilised".

It is regrettable that the British Clergy confined their 'confidence' to the *British* Commonwealth of Nations. They might have expressed at least the 'hope' that their appeal would be accepted by *all* nations. Yet, let there be rejoicing that 'the prodigals have returned'; that the Protestant and the Roman Catholic Churches, which have been warring against each

other, for four centuries, since the advent of Martin Luther; have been joined together, by a vast common misfortune, in a common cause. Only, they are saying, very late, what "quasi-universal opinion" has been saying loudly ever since the previous World War, and less loudly for decades before that. If the high dignitaries of the Church, the successors of 'the Son of Man who did not know where to lay his head', had begun, in good time, to say boldly, from their 'palaces', what they are saying now; and to teach such ideas to their 'flocks' courageously, with fear of God, and without fear of man, in their hearts; then, very likely, both the World Wars might have been averted. But it has been ever thus, with organised Churches and States. Instead of giving timely and righteous lead to their peoples, on to the right path, and shedding on it the light of benevolent wisdom, they have mostly made the peoples subserve their selfishness; and the peoples have had to advance, *despite* these Churches and States, with unspeakable travail; and then the Church and State have come after them, for their own advantage, repeating what the peoples have already made commonly known truths and ideals. The case has been the same with Pandit and Maulavi in India, and indeed, the priest-class and the ruler-class everywhere, in all countries. But better late than never. Let us rejoice that 'the prodigals have returned', even at this late hour; and let us hope and pray that they may not slide back again.

It may be mentioned here, that the Theosophical Society (founded in 1875) has, for its first object, "To form a nucleus of the *Universal Brotherhood* of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, caste, color, or sex"; and for its second, "To encourage the Study of Comparative Religion, Philosophy, and Science" (with a view to realise essential identities). But it has so far been looked at askance, or even directly reviled, by the 'orthodox' of every 'race, creed, caste, color, or sex'; and has been banned in Russia, Germany, Italy, Spain, etc.; for this very reason, that it has sought to promote "universal love" and the general welfare of "the whole human race," and bring the religions nearer to each other, and make peace between the creeds, abate all conflicts, reconcile all enemies, and help towards 'peace on earth and good-will among men', and re-establish 'the kingdom of heaven on this earth.' That it has not succeeded appreciably, in producing any change of heart, in the human world, though it has branches in fifty countries and more, is due, no doubt, to some serious internal

weaknesses of its own, as much as to the overwhelming strength, for the time being, of the world-enveloping dark forces of egoist ambition, greed, lust, hate; to members attaching more importance to persons than principles, and thinking of 'the Brothers' and 'occult powers' more than of 'Brotherhood' (as is plainly said in *The Mahatma Letters*, p. 252). But the awful horrors of this second World War are likely to exhaust these dark forces, purge off the weaknesses of Churches as well as of bodies like the T. S., and compel human beings of all countries to *co-operate*. "Whom the Lord loveth, He chasteneth." In the meanwhile, the T. S. is at least holding up the banner of its unquestionably noble objects.

The declarations, quoted below, of eminent *soldiers*, will illustrate what has been said above, that timely action by the *clergy* would have prevented the two World Wars, and indeed, would minimise, or even put an end to, all wars and political slaughters.

"...If you *clergy* would do your duty, we *soldiers*, would soon lose our jobs', said Field Marshal Lord Haig, addressing a Church Assembly...General Sir Ian Hamilton said the other day: 'My vision of the world is one of mounting nationalism, mounting tariff walls, and mounting over-drafts on God's patience. Speak, write, agitate for your lives, for the life of civilisation. Insist on the Disarmament Commission bringing some concrete act home with them. If we now make what Dante calls the great refusal, Europe is ruined' ..Not only Europe, but the whole world...The words of Lord Kitchener are true: 'Moderation in war is imbecility. If we go to war at all, we must intend to win, whatever the cost. No private rights, *no scruples* of conscience, no sentiments of chivalry, must be allowed to stand in the way of victory'...(Lord Haig's statement) was tantamount to a declaration that his own profession was a menace to civilisation, and that it was in the power of the Church to destroy that menace, by loyalty to the teaching of their Divine Exemplar...Within a few weeks of the Peace Conference, one of our great military authorities warned us that 'the seeds of future conflicts were sown in *every quarter* of the globe'. Preparations for another war are being made on an unprecedented scale, despite of Conferences on reduction of armaments...*Without* the help of the so-called Christian Churches, Governments could never wage war at all...It was not until apostate priests sold the Church to the State, in return for temporal power and domination, that men's

minds warped on the question of military service...If this (i. e. what Lord Kitchener said) be the case with the aggressive force, what may we expect of the other party, fighting with its back to the wall for sheer existence? Will it be likely to have *any scruples* about observing the so-called 'Rules of Civilised Warfare'? No, any satanic contrivance will be deemed permissible if it appears to afford the chance of salvation...Poison gas, liquid fire, high explosives, and even disease germs...will be rained down, not upon the military, but upon the civil population, from thousands of aircraft. F. M. Sir W. Robertson said: '...All these attacks will be made at first—against the civil population'...The idea of this is clear. The most frightful of war's horrors are to fall upon the women and children and non-combatants generally, in order that the destruction and terror thus wrought may compel the enemy to submission, unless he in his turn can produce some more maddening terror. The perpetration of these diabolical crimes upon the weak and defenceless is to be the work of such Christian men and women as will submit themselves to the direction of the military machines." These extracts are taken from Dr. A. L. Delisle's address, 'The Last War and the Next,' in *World-Fellowship*, pp. 439-442; it was delivered in 1933. What is said in the extracts regarding the Christian clergy, applies equally, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Hindu and Muslim clergy. Church and State, in benevolent co-operation, could lift Humanity to heaven on earth. In malevolent co-operation, they have been repeatedly leading it to hell. The new World War was seen to be coming, for many years. It was even said publicly, in the papers, by the military and political experts, that it would begin in 1939, when all Governments would have completed their military preparations. Frantic warnings were uttered by the peace-minded, in all countries. All in vain. The Churches failed very reprehensibly, to do their duty.

It is matter for devout thankfulness that, so far, some remnant of sanity in the belligerents is keeping them back from the use of that culminating horror, 'poison gas', which was freely used in the previous World War, and by Italy in her inhuman outrage upon Abyssinia. But, if the Madness of Mutual Hate and Wrath mounts higher with the prolongation of the war, then, who knows, Satan may yet have his fill.

What the Heads of the Churches should do.

The papers also reported that His Holiness the Pope, in the course of a broadcast Christmas message, on 24.12.1940,

after repeating some moral exhortations, (which are utterly futile without the setting of a Rational World Order), said: "There emerges ever more clearly in mind, a *quasi universal opinion*...that Europe and its political structure are now undergoing a transformation of such a nature as to signal the dawn of a new era...*Something new, better, more advanced, more sound, free and stronger, must replace the past order*, and eliminate its defects...The various parties differ in their ideals and aims, but agree in their desire for a *new arrangement*, and do not consider possible or desirable a return to former conditions. The sole interest of the Church is to *establish a society* which would be humanly praise-worthy, spiritually elevating, and a source of genuine good. We pray that men will grow mature enough to establish a *New and just Social and Economic Order*".

Then why do not the Pope and the Archbishops of Christendom, as they should be able to do, urge all the belligerents to make a truce for a while, and call a Conference of the most thoughtful and peace-minded, 'the best and wisest', representatives of these "parties (which) differ in their ideals and aims, but agree in their desire for a new arrangement", to settle the terms of such 'new arrangement', with tongue, pen, ink, and paper, instead of guns, bombs, aeroplanes, and submarines?

Humanity needs more Rshis than Pandits, more Auliyās than Maulavis, more 'Prophets', who will rebuke and compel bad rulers, than tiara-ed and mitre-ed and biretta-ed 'Priests', who will subserve the selfish purposes of such bad rulers.

The Disastrous Corruptions of Home, Church, State, Trade, and Science

Always, whatever the Principle of Goodness in Nature, the Principle of Love and Altruism, creates for the happiness of living beings, that, the Principle of Evil, of Hate and Egoism, perverts into a means of their misery. "The mighty Goddess of Illusion, Māyā, flings the blinding veils of selfish lusts and hates over the eyes of even the wisest, catches their necks with the stiffening hands of stubborn pride, and flings them into the clutches of Madness".¹ The angels were born to sing and dance and rejoice together in harmony; the first and greatest of them promptly changed himself into the prince of devils, Ego-ism and Pride incarnate, to create

¹ *Durgā-saptā-shatī*.

discord and woe and wailing everywhere. The Go(o)d in Man sent forth all-loving all-uniting 'Religion', Dharma, to bind the scattered hearts of men to each other and to God again, (*re*, again, and *legere*, to bind; *d h r*, to bind and hold together); the D-Evil in man perverted it into a trade, and a frightful means for tearing hearts asunder, literally and metaphorically. The higher Self, the Group-Soul of Humanity, evolved the grand and noble thought of 'Royalty' embodied, to be defender of the right, and rejoicer and protector of the weak (*rex, regis, rectus, regno, rego*; *Skt. raksh, ranj, rta*, to protect, to please, to rule and regulate, to make right); the separatist and individualist lower self of man, debased that embodied Power and Authority and Rulership into offender and oppressor. The Collective intelligence of Humanity evolved the beneficent idea of 'Commerce', to bring mercy to all, to fertilise, feed, foster all, to bear all burdens, (*Skt. sam*, all, *mṛsh*, to bear patiently and sprinkle with nourishment, *mṛd* to make happy); the selfish greed of man has changed it into the horrid shape of ruthless Mammon, ruining millions of human lives, deliberately destroying instead of multiplying the means of nourishment, in order to inflate prices, and misappropriate and monopolise, for the selfish luxury of one, what was meant for the comforting of thousands. The Supreme Mystery behind all things created man and woman to be supplementary halves to each other, and the child to keep them bound in bonds of love always; but the Lust of man has changed the woman, intended to be the Mother of the Home, into a plaything, chattel, slave, and courtesan and prostitute, subtly spreading deadly virus, psychical and physical, in the veins of all society. That Mystery gave Divine Science to the intellect of men, that they may help each other, by its means, to ever more refined civilisation, and rise to the heights of angels; Satan infused fiendish selfishness into their heart, which has perverted and prostituted all the science, and debased them to the state of demoniac titans, so that Caen is always murdering Abel by that science.

Perpetual Strife of Altruism against Egoism.

Therefore, always too the Principle of Good must contend unremittingly against and endeavour to bring under control, the Principle of Evil, in all those great departments of life; and in the Home, first of all, and more than in the other three; for out of the Home, out of the Family, originate all those others, the Spiritual, the Temporal, the 'Commercial and

the Educational Powers and institutions.

It is *excessive* Lust, and *excessive* Greed of (a) Glory, Honor, Fame, or (b) Power, or (c) Wealth, or (d) Sex and Sensual Pleasures, which create ill-born, abnormal, evil-natured human beings, and then Hatreds and Wars, and bring ruin upon civilisations. This Lust, this Greed, must be *controlled* and *regulated*, by a 'Rational World Order', in close accord and co-operation with a 'Rational World Religion', if Humanity is to live.

The 'Practicality' of the Indian National Congress.

In India, as to the 'practicalities' of the Congress—what need to describe them? The fruits, by which they have to be judged, are as patent here, as in the west. We have been very fortunate in that, so far, thanks to Mahatma Gandhi's persistent preaching of Non-Violence, there has been nothing like the 'violence' of the 'civilised' West and of the 'Pacific' coast. But the terrible *psychical* explosives, the excessive greeds, lusts, hates, and ambitions for personal power, (which are the manufacturers of the *physical* explosives), have gathered and are present, and menacing, in India too, all the same, thanks to the 'practicalities' of the leaders, the *mis*-leaders, of the communal and other political parties, the British Government of India, and the Congress. The heads of the Congress and of the politico-communist parties have all equally failed to come to terms with that Government, and with each other. The only thing that all these different groups of politicians, (one in 'power', and the others trying to get it), agree in, is in feeling and saying to one another, 'What suits my interest is practical; what suits yours is unpractical'; as rival theologians say to each other, 'My doxy is orthodox; your doxy is heterodoxy'.

The Suggestions which arise in this Setting.

In such setting, the following suggestions are made. Of course, if the doings above sketched are 'practical', the suggestions are very 'un-practical'. But when many-columned small-typed, large-sized pages after pages of the dailies are filled, day after day, with the futile 'correspondences', 'interviews', 'resolutions', pronouncements, manifestoes, communiques, speeches, explanations, of prominent many-worded little-meaningful casuistical and sophistical politicians and diplomatists, in or out of office; when such are patiently endured, or even eagerly looked for, welcomed, and read avidly; then, perhaps, for a change, a few 'unpractical' suggestions too may be 'gladly suffered'—and considered.

**The first suggestion—
to the British Government of India.**

In a speech, at Bombay, on 16th September, 1940, Mahatma Gandhi said, "I cannot give you a definition of Swa-raj. I have not been able to define Swa-raj". But he wants Swa-raj all the same; and, of course, so do all the other Congress leaders, though they do not know the meaning of it any more. The leaders of the other two most important and most vocal and audible parties, the politico-communal Muslim League and Hindu Maha Sabha, also want 'Independence'; and they are able to 'define' that word as 'Muslim-Raj', and 'Hindu-Raj' respectively. They do not care to think out whether these two 'definitions', appearing face to face against each other, make for 'Independence', or for greater 'Dependence' upon a Third Party, which maintains at least the outward appearance of Peace between Hindu and Muslim in the 'Great Dependency' of India; though, most unfortunately, it cannot maintain peace in Europe. Nor do they care to carry their 'definitions' further on; to explain how 'Muslim-Raj' will make every Muslim happy, or how 'Hindu-Raj' will make every Hindu happy; or whether Muslim and Hindu are human beings also, or only Muslim and only Hindu.

So long as this is the condition of affairs, no radical change in the present regime may seem to be immediately needed, or, indeed, to be possible, in India, (apart from incalculable world-events). Yet it is obvious that there is a *vast unrest* throughout the land. The condition of the Indian People and its leaders, is like that of an infant which is very hungry, and cries, but cannot speak out what it wants; or like that of a grown-up man who is very ill, with manifold diseases, and groans and writhes; but can only ask another for remedy; for he himself does not know what the proper medicine is, which will cure him. Clearly it is not good for either the people or the administration, *that this great unrest, this serious malady*, should continue unallayed, or be aggravated by improper drugs.

**Declare Dominion Status for India now, at once,
with conditions.**

Why not then give to them all, as suggested below, the simple remedy, an *active* proof of Britain's good faith, that they all want? That will abate the unrest, and give the needed time, to all concerned, for proper readjustment of affairs.

The late Mr. George Lansbury, benevolent, sincere, philanthropic, honorable old gentleman, trusted and deeply respected leader of the Labor Party in Britain, ex-Cabinet Minister and Leader of the Opposition, in the course of an article on 'Labor Policy in India', contributed to the *Hindustan Times* (New Delhi), 1-7-1934, said: "I have come definitely to the conclusion that Annie Besant's scheme is the only way. Some years ago, Dr. Annic Besant and a group of representative Indians, with the valuable assistance of our good friend and lifelong champion of India, David Graham Polc, drew up a Commonwealth of India Bill, which Henry Snell, John Scurr, and myself and others introduced in the House of Commons...But the Bill never got a second reading...There is only one way out for a Socialist Government. We should summon, or ask Indians themselves to summon, a *Constituent Assembly*, and hand over to that Assembly the task of deciding the future Government of India". That Bill embodies the main principles on which was also based the *Outline Scheme of Swaraj* prepared by the late Deshbandhu C. R. Das, and published in 1923. But the Bill is cast in forms more suitable to British ways of thinking. This was very rightly and naturally to be expected from Mrs. Besant's intimate acquaintance with the Indian as well as the English ways of thinking and feeling. That the Labor Party of Britain has been sympathetic to India, was largely due to her mediation.

The first suggestion—to the British Government of India—that this book makes, is only Mr. Lansbury's suggestion, with modifications suited to present conditions.

Let the British Government, through its Parliament, declare forthwith (1) that India is given, now, at once, Swaraj, such as that of the Dominions under the Statue of Westminster; (2) that the Indian People should proceed, making their own arrangements for it, without asking the British

Government of India for any help, except that of maintenance of peace as usual, (and also without any hindrance from it, direct or indirect), to call together their Constituent Assembly, and draw up their Constitution in conformity with that Statute; (3) that the Executive Administration of India will be carried on just as at present, until the new Constitution is formulated and agreed upon by that Constituent Assembly; and (4) that as soon as the Constitution is completely formulated and agreed upon, so soon will the existing Executive Administration change itself into an administration in accord with that new Constitution.

It is certain that until the leaders succeed in replacing in their minds, the present misty and smoky haze of catch-words, slogans, partisan and communal bigotries, selfishnesses, and hatreds, by the clear light of a benevolent, humanist, rational, definition of the meaning of the word 'Swaraj', of its connotation and contents, (and true Swa-raj is only another name for 'Rational World-Order'), in the shape of, at least an outline (of course, tentative and changeable from time to time in the light of changing circumstances) of appurtenant industrial, economic, protective, educational, and other policies—until they do so, they will *never* succeed in agreeing upon a Constitution; and the Executive Administration will continue to do its work in peace; making real improvements in it, in the direction of making it genuinely more helpful to, and popular with, the people.

If the people should succeed, by some miraculous grace of God or Nature or Matter or their own Better and Wiser Mind, in such replacement, and therefore, in drawing up and agreeing upon a Constitution, then, it is equally certain, they will have proved themselves worthy of Swa-raj, capable of winning it, capable of maintaining it and carrying it on; and the Constitution which they formulate, will be not only helpful to India but may be of service, by way of suggestions, to other countries also. What is good for 350 millions, may well be helpful to many of the remaining 1650 millions too.

The Great Advantages of Doing So.

Over and above the advantages, above indicated, of

satisfying the cry, for a mere word, of these parties, there is another and very great gain to be derived from such an immediate recognition by Britain, of full Dominion Status for India, as integral part of an Indo-British Commonwealth.

The Indian dailies have reported that, in a speech at Munich, on 9 Nov. 1939, Hitler said that

"If Britain started granting her own Empire full liberty by restoring the freedom of India, we should have bowed before her".

Britain should have taken advantage of this very important utterance long ago, even though it may have been insincere propagandism. But 'it is never too late to mend' and 'better late than never'.¹ Now that the greatest capital town of the human world, London, and one of the five or six next greatest capital towns, viz, Berlin, as well as a great many smaller towns in Europe, North Africa, China, Indo-China, Thailand, are being frightfully devastated, it is very high time that wiser counsels should prevail. The latest descriptions of the havoc wrought in London are appalling. Very great, undoubtedly, is the admiration aroused by the indomitable heroism, the titanic energy, the dauntless determination, the amazing organisation, with which the British people generally are prosecuting the war, and the citizens of London especially continue to carry on their daily routine business, amidst the soul-harrowing ruins and desolation of their palatial homes, places of worship, priceless art-treasures. We have less information about how the civilian population of Berlin is faring and behaving. But, all the same, very great also is the sadness of the reflection that all this is only hardening the hatred in the hearts on both sides of this war of titans; and that, saddest of all, it was, and is, *wholly avoidable*, if only the leaders of the belligerents were truly civilised enough, had 'common-sense' enough, to *confer with each other*, with sincerely philanthropic motive, as to *how the good of both*, Britain and Germany, and, at the same time, of all the other countries, can be promoted best.

¹"We cannot persuade the people of Germany that we are fighting to free Europe, unless we set out at once to free India": Sir R. Acland, M.P., *Unser Kampf*, p. 158. Many other influential dailies and authors, in Britain and U. S. A., have been writing to the same effect.

If Britain declares Dominion Status for India at once the pretended ground is cut away from Hitler's agreements for warring against Britain; presumably Hitler would not be able to go back on what he has thus said; and if he tried to, then all the world would rise against him, and India would energetically and whole-heartedly throw all her moral, material, and vital resources on the side of Britain. No doubt, Hitler has broken promises and betrayed trust within the last three years, with regard to Britain, according to the reports in the papers. But the statesmen and rulers of which nation have not broken promises in past and current history? "Let him who is without sin, cast the first stone". Can any say that their record is free from blame? When such ghastly tragedies are occurring every day in Britain, it would not be seemly to mention specific instances of British statesmen's own grievous failures in this respect.

The danger from Japan would also be eliminated, and the war on China would abate; for Japan would no longer be able to feel and say that it is better for China to become subject to Japan, than to European Powers in the way that India has become subject to Britain. That jealousy, that fear, that hatred, of what is at present called British Imperialism, that wish to imitate it, and that greed to get shares in the thirteen million square miles of the earth's surface (about five of them practically uninhabited, though habitable and utilisable by modern scientific methods) now owned by Britain—all this, which now fills the hearts of the other Powers, would be dispersed at one stroke. The way for the establishment of a New World Order, in accordance with the deliberations of a Conference of Philanthropic (instead of murderous) Scientists, *of all countries*, such as has been spoken of above, would be made smooth and easy.

World Opinion and India.

India has been the Apple of Discord for rival imperialisms, for *many* centuries now. A 'New World Order', a 'Better World', which even statesmen in office in the warring countries, are beginning to wish and hope for and talk about, will be impossible to achieve, until India, the Mother of Nations, Religions, Civilisations, has been raised up from the mud and mire into which she has been dragged down by the heavy sins of her own children, as well as by the sins of others, and is set upon her feet again, and enabled to bless humanity anew. It is well known that public opinion in the U. S. A. is

greatly exercised over the relation between Britain and India. It is also well known that in Britain itself, a thoughtful and conscientious section in almost every political party, and the Labour Party as a whole, feel keenly the gross injustice of continuing to keep India deprived of full Dominion Status, under one pretext or another.

The willing, generous, graceful recognition of such Status for India by Britain, whose inhabitants today are descendants of some of the latest off-shoots of that Aryan Stock whose primal home was the larger trans-and-cis-Himalayan India, would at once turn American opinion completely in favour of Britain; enlist world-opinion generally on her side;¹ leave Hitler without any excuse for hostility against Britain; disarm jealousies and rivalries and hatreds all round; raise Britain's moral status immensely; give her the ethical hegemony of the human world; pave the way strongly and surely for universal disarmament; and make a New World Order and a Better World feasible, practicable, realisable. An Indo-British Commonwealth, within which there has been established a Rational good Self-government in India,

a Self-government which is also Good-government, because it is the *'Government of the people, for the people, by the most good and wise, the most philanthropic and experienced, of the people'*—

such an Indo-British Commonwealth will be the strongest foundation and the surest beginning of a World Commonwealth. A fourth of the land-surface of the globe, a fourth of its population, will be at once included in it. The remainder will not and can not resist the good and great example.

America and the World War.

World-opinion, and especially American opinion, as to the relations between India and Britain, in connection with

¹ The Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, said to the Chambers of Commerce, in Calcutta, on 15. 12. 1940, "...As I speak to you today, we are faced with a movement, supported by the Congress Party, which is open to grave misunderstanding outside...". The president of the Muslim League, as M. L. A. (Central), was reported by the papers as having spoken, in the course of the Finance Bill Debate, in November, 1940, to the effect that "there was no fool in America, such that he did not know the nature of the relation between Britain and India".

this horrible World War, has been referred to before. Some comments may be made, on this point, here.

"Pious Frauds."

President Roosevelt, in the course of a broadcast to the American nation, on 30-12-40, said: "The Nazis justified such acts by pious frauds, like occupying a country to restore order, or protect it against aggression". This is true, no doubt. But is *any* of the Great Powers of today, free from such deeds? Is the history of the U. S. A. itself free from such piousnesses? What about the indigenous Amer-Indians, and the Philippines, and other Pacific Isles? Has not Japan been *copying* Britain and other European Powers faithfully in these matters? Who has led the race in Imperialism? Are not the new competitors in that awful race copying that leader? What does history say as to who first invented the diplomatic phrases, 'peaceful penetration', 'opening markets', 'commercial expansion', 'protectorate', 'civilising the heathen', 'gentlemanly understanding', 'spheres of influence', 'maintaining peace', 'restoring order', 'white man's burden', 'trusteeship of the weaker peoples', 'mandatories', etc.? All such accusations and recriminations only increase the mutual bitterness and hate of all concerned.

Better say: "We have all Sinned".

The only way to really 'restore order' and peace to terribly harrassed Mankind, is, for *all* the rulers and leaders to *join* in sincerely crying:

'Peccavi; we have all sinned; let bygones be bygones; let us sit down together and think out, in earnest sympathetic consultation, a better New World Order than anything there has been hitherto'.

President Roosevelt should use all the vast influence and power attaching to his exalted position, towards *this* end.

The Poison of Imperialism.

An article entitled 'Wake up, America!', in the *Reader's Digest* (New York), for July, 1940, makes a powerful appeal to the U. S. A. to give all the help it can to Britain, since it is the shield and 'frontier' of America now, against Nazi aggression and invasion. The article says: "A Nazi victory in Europe is bound to create a coalition of European and Asiatic aggressor Powers who will be masters of the British, French, Dutch, Belgian, Danish, and Portuguese *Empires*. So tremendous a victory will not satiate their

appetite, but vet it ; the booty to be had by *looting the richest lands on earth* will more than make up for their material losses in conquering them.....They would squeeze and blackmail us as they have done so efficiently to the British in the past few years". Then the writer goes on to speak of "the far-flung complex of American interest".

He is no doubt perfectly right in making the appeal, and writing what else he has written ; and in the six months that have elapsed since, as the intensity of the war has grown, the view, expressed in the article, has gained ground greatly in the U. S. A. But the view is right only if the standpoint of 'nationalist power-politics' and 'imperialism' is accepted as just and correct ; not otherwise. The horrors of the preceding and present World Wars have arisen only because there are so many *empires* which already "loot and squeeze and blackmail" those, "the richest lands on earth". If, instead, there were a Rational World Order, a World Federation, a World Commonwealth, of *all nations and peoples*, all such horrors would be avoided.

'Imperialism' has always brought devastating war in its wake. Yudhishtira, good man though he was, craved to perform the Rāja-suya sacrifice. i. e., to be crowned and called Emperor, Samrāt. He was warned by the Rishi Nārada. He did not obey. He got himself crowned Emperor. The Mahābhārata War, the Great War of five thousand years ago, followed. Its work was completed by the Yādava civil war, thirty-six years later. Militarism was destroyed in India, for the time. But the life of the people was also shattered, for long, and was slowly rebuilt, on the lines of Varṇ-āshrama Dharma.

"It is related that, when Mr. Chamberlain left Munich" (Sep. 1939) "Hitler said, soon after, 'Why need I bother about the old German Colonies, when in a year's time, I shall have the Belgian and Dutch *Empires*, and, soon after, the British.'..."¹

Some valuable observations are made by Mr. W. B. Curry, in a very recent book, on the subject of "the problem of colonies" owned by "the empires". They deserve careful consideration in this connection. "There exist, in the world, undeveloped areas, inhabited by populations not yet ripe for

¹ Hugh Dalton, M. P., *Hitler's War, Before and after*, pp. 83,84.

self-government, and at present governed autocratically by certain of the Great Powers. Those Powers who did not possess (such) colonies, either because they were *late in the race*, or because, like Germany, they were *deprived of them* in the last war, are filled with a sense of injustice. Our own position in England is somewhat disingenuous.. What is wrong is, not that we have the colonies, instead of Germany. *What is wrong is, that anybody has the colonies.* The only way to take the question out of the arena of international squabbling, is to put them once and for all under international control'. The case of the 'dependency' which is now naturally seeking 'independence', viz., India, is different from that of such 'colonies'. Mr. Curry says, "India and China, between them, comprise about half the human race; and it is clear that no proposal that aims at *the organisation of the affairs of the whole planet*", (i. e., in other words, a New World Order), "can afford to neglect them for long. ...Both countries are at present subject to foreign control, both have been the victims of *imperial* exploitation, both have a passionate desire for freedom, and *neither*, left to itself, seems likely to be a *menace* to its neighbours....The best service we could render them would be to secure them freedom from external molestation. Plainly this freedom is necessary, and a Federal Union should set itself to secure it...As regards India, all that is necessary is *British good faith*...The Working Committee of the Indian National Congress has issued a statement, deploring the action of the British Government in declaring India a belligerent country without her consent, etc....It appeals for a declaration of *War Aims*, and, in particular, of how these supply to the problem of India. It points out that *vague declarations* that we are fighting for *liberty and democracy*, are not enough, and that the post-war history 'is full of betrayals of proclaimed ideals'. It 'invites the British Government to *declare unequivocally*, their *War aims*, regarding *democracy and imperialism* and the establishment of a *New World Order*, and how those aims will be applied to India *now*, and whether they include the *elimination of imperialism*, and the treatment of India as a free nation whose policy is guided by her own people. The real *test* of their declaration, is its *application to India at present*'. They make it clear that 'A free India will gladly join other nations for *Mutual defence, economic co-operation, and a New World Order based on freedom*', and that, as a free country and with her

energies released, India must play her part in World Re-organisation.' Is it not clear from this, that an India released from her burning sense of injustice, and provided with technical and financial *assistance, not domination*, in the solution of her own problems, would presently play a far from negligible part in the New World Order to be created?...No civilised westerner, who has visited China, has failed to return full of admiration, for the sensitiveness to beauty, the grace and charm, the profound rationality and sensible *pacifism* that characterise her ancient civilisation. At present, China is being driven to adopt some of *our western militarism* and the *vices* that go with it, and, if we are not careful, she may be driven to adopt a *militant* form of *nationalism*....In allowing China to become the *battle-ground* of a *rival imperialism*, we have run a frightful risk, not merely to China, but to civilisation as a whole. ...If peace can be restored to China...no nation will welcome more whole-heartedly the opportunity that Federal Union provides, of co-operating in the building of a peaceful, democratic, Sane World Order. From a China rescued from aggression, there is much to hope, and nothing to fear save demons of our own creation."¹

The Views of the Indian National Congress, on Imperialism and Fascism-Nazism.

The statement of the Indian National Congress Working Committee, from which Mr. Curry has derived his extracts, is dated 14-9-1939. It is an admirably-worded presentation of India's position and attitude, world-statesman-like, cogent, forceful, dignified, irrefutable. Though it does not say so, it may be regarded as a reply to the Viceroy Lord Linlithgow's broadcast, made immediately after the commencement of the war, asking India to give help to Britain in the 'war for freedom.' It was adopted and endorsed by the All India Congress Committee, on 10-10-1939. It seems desirable to subjoin here, a fairly full abstract of it.

"The Working Committee have given their earnest consideration to the grave crisis that has developed, owing to the declaration of war in Europe...Since then, the British Government have declared India a belligerent country and promulgated ordinances, passed the Government of India Act Amending Bill, and taken other far-reaching measures,

¹ W. B. Curry, *The Case for Federal Union*, (1940, Penguin Series), pp. 112-113, 195-197.

which affect the Indian People vitally, and circumscribe and limit the powers and activities of the Provincial Governments. This has been done without the consent of the Indian People, whose declared wishes in such matters have been deliberately ignored by the British Government. ... The Congress has repeatedly declared its entire disapproval of the ideology and practice of Fascism and Nazism...It has seen in Fascism and Nazism, the intensification of the principle of Imperialism against which the Indian People have struggled for many years...Co-operation must be between equals, by mutual consent, for the cause which both consider to be worthy... The People of India, in the recent past, faced great risks and made great sacrifices, to secure their own freedom, and establish a free democratic State in India; and their sympathy is entirely on the side of democracy and freedom ; but India cannot associate herself in this war, said to be for democratic freedom, when that very freedom is denied her, and such limited freedom as she possesses is taken away from her....The history of the recent past is full of examples, showing constant divergence from the spoken word, the ideals proclaimed, the declared war aims, and the real motives and objectives, during the War of 1914-18 ..While stating that they did not want any acquisition of territory, the victorious powers added largely to their colonial domains...The League of Nations was muzzled, and strangled at the outset, and, later on, killed by its parent states...If this war is to defend the status quo of imperialist possessions of colonies and vested interests and privileges, then India can have nothing to do with it. If, however, the issue is Democracy and World Order based on Democracy, then India is intensely interested in it. The Committee are convinced that the interests of Indian Democracy do not conflict with the interests of British Democracy or World Democracy. But there is inherent an ineradicable conflict between Democracy for India or elsewhere, and Imperialism and Fascism. If Great Britain fights for the the maintenance and extension of Democracy, then she must necessarily end Imperialism in her own possessions, and establish full democracy in India, and the Indian People must have a right of self-determination, by framing their own constitution through a Constituent Assembly, without external interference, and must guide their own policy. A free and democratic India will gladly associate herself with other free nations, for mutual defence against aggression, and for economic co-operation. She will work

for establishment of a New World Order, based on freedom and democracy, utilising the World's Knowledge and Resources for the progress and advancement of Humanity. ...India is the *crux* of the problem; for India has been an outstanding example of modern imperialism; and no Re-fashioning of the World can succeed, which ignores this vital problem. With her vast resources, she must play an important part in any Scheme of World Re-organisation.The true measure of democracy is ending of Imperialism and Fascism alike...Only on that basis can the New Order be built up. In the struggle for that New World Order, the Committee are eager to help in every way...The Working Committee, therefore, invite the British Government to declare, in unequivocal terms, what their war aims are, in regard to democracy and imperialism and the New Order that is envisaged; in particular, how these aims are going to apply to India, and to be given effect to in the present...A clear declaration about the future, pledging the British Government to the ending of Imperialism and Fascism alike, will be welcomed by the *people of all countries*, but it is far more important to *give immediate effect* to it, to the largest possible extent; for *only this will convince* the people that the declaration is meant to be honored. The real test of any declaration is its *application in the present*, for it is the present that will govern the action today, and will give shape to the future... That horror (*i. e.*, War) has to be checked in Europe and China, but it will not end till its root-causes, Fascism and Imperialism, are removed...".

Britain's reaction to the Wardha Statement.

The National Herald (Lucknow, D/-9 and 11, Oct., 1939) reported (as from its London office): "The Wardha statement has attracted greater attention than all the previous Congress declarations. Many people find in it an echo of the issues uppermost in their own minds...This is reflected in increasing demands for a statement of *war aims* from the Government, despite the desire not to embarrass the Government publicly. Mr. Lloyd George's speech was not an isolated reflection of a lone politician. The Scottish Labor Union, the Democratic Control, the Peace Council, and the University students are all thinking in the same strain, and are *demanding a clear statement of war aims*. The *News Chronicle*, the *New Statesman and Nation*, the *Daily Herald*, *Reynolds' News*, the *Tribune*, the *Manchester Guardian*, and the *Daily Worker*.

have all supported the Congress demand and emphasised the urgency and unanswerableness of the Congress case. The first five demand a declaration of Indian freedom with *immediate implementation* through factual responsibility at the centre, consequent on an agreement with the Congress. The *Manchester Guardian*, in a strong leader, stresses the imperativeness of responding to the Congress gesture. Though it offers no concrete suggestions, it definitely asks that action should be taken at once." "The *Daily Herald*, in a leader says: ...The danger of failure is less in India than at home, less from real complexities of the problem than from conservative and vested interests which regard every move towards Indian self-government—as something to be resisted solemnly. This is always stupidity. At the present moment, it is stupidity which verges on treason. The war may be long. It may spread to the East. That India should be a contented and co-operative partner of the Commonwealth, at this juncture is overriding, in imperial interest". (The word 'imperial' should be regarded as a slip of the pen for 'British and world'). All this shows how strong the feeling is, in an important section of the British People, in favour of fulfilling immediately, the just demand of India.

The One lack in the Congress leadership.

The one great weakness of the Congress is that, while rightly asking the British Government to declare her 'peace and war aims', it has so far been unable to declare its own 'peace and war aims', beyond the *catchwords* 'Swaraj,' 'Independence', 'Freedom', 'Democracy'. None of its leaders (with one exception) has put forward (and, presumably, has thought out) any definite outline of a *Scheme* of Swa-raj or Self-government, the outline of a constitution, which could and would be pondered on and discussed by the public, prepare the ground for the desired future Constituent Assembly, give urgently needed education to the electors and potential electees, and save much wrangling and much time and trouble when the Constituent Assembly actually meets; save the elected members from having to discuss every point, every principle, every detail, *ab initio* and *de novo*. Some of us have been trying to impress the great need of this, upon the Congress and the general public, for the last twenty years, ever since the creed of the Congress was changed, at the annual session at Nagpur, in 1920, from, 'Self-government along Colonial lines' to 'Swaraj', which was deliberately left undefined. But

we have had no success, so far, except for some partial attempts, soon abandoned. More on this point will be said later.

Mere Promises and Protestations are of no use.

Mere protestations by Cabinet Ministers and Viceroys that "the promise of Dominion Status *still stands firmly*", that "Dominion Status *remains* the Goal for India", that "Our objective *remains* to lead India to the proclaimed Goal of Dominion Status, and that as early as *may be*", (this last was said by the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, at Calcutta, on 15-12-1940)—such asseverations '*remain*' mere 'diplomacy', and are felt to be quibbling mockery. The promise should not *stand still* firmly rooted to the ground; it should *move forward* rapidly to fulfilment. The Goal should not *remain* a Goal for ever; "the one far-off divine event to which the whole creation moves". It should be *approached and attained* quickly; as it would have been, long ago, to the very great gain of both Britain and India and of the world at large; if the British Government, even after assuming sovereignty over India in 1857-'8, (when, surely, it became, before Man and God *i.e.*, its own conscience, responsible for the welfare of the People), had not continued to take ignoble advantage of the great weaknesses of the Indian politico-religious mis-leaders and their followers; and had itself led righteously, and discharged its God-appointed duty to, the Indian People, justly and generously. India has, no doubt, been punished for her grievous sins. But so shall every nation be, which sins. "God will not be mocked," "Our sins shall find us out." "Sins come home to roost". "Offences needs must come, but woe unto those through whom they come."

The late Mr. Chamberlain's government failed to carry out the promises of help and protection given to Czechoslovakia, and abandoned her to Hitler. President Benes, left that country, placing a curse upon Britain. Upright Britons themselves expressed shame. Mr. Chamberlain said he could not go to war for "a far away country of which we know nothing", though when she was promised help, she was neither any nearer nor more known. But Czechoslovakia was not blameless either. In God's account-books, she must have been debited very heavily with the grievous sin of the Skoda and the two other armament works, "among the largest in the world...and at least one large poison-gas factory", which spread the instruments of wholesale butchery all around,

and made vast profits out of the war-madness of all the nations. These profits went to many millionaire shareholders of many of those same nations. All these armanent works and vast quantities of munitions have passed into the hands of Germany. In March, 1939, "Mr. Chamberlain suddenly guaranteed Poland", though Mr. Lloyd George pointed out in open Parliament that he was making promises which he could not possibly fulfil. When Poland was invaded by Germany, on 1-9-1939, Britain could not send her any help. She declared war again Germany. But Mr. K. Zilliacus, a naturalised Englishman, published a book, *Between Two Wars*, early in 1939, before the war broke out, which makes it clear that if Britain did, after all, take up arms against Germany, very, very late, it was not because Mr. Chamberlain, and others of his way of thinking, had any more love for Poland than for Czecho-Slovakia, or she was nearer and better known, but because Hitler now demands the return of the German Colonies, taken by Britain after the previous World War, and because Britain's other Colonies and her empire over India and other possessions are threatened; though these are very much farther away than Czecho-Slovakia, and were scarcely better known to Mr. Chamberlain. A British White Paper, (published 21-9-1939) gives the German reply to the British ultimatum on 3-9-1939, and mentions that on 25-8-1939, Hitler, in a conversation with Sir Neville Henderson, "put forward his *colonial demand*, and if its return was guaranteed, he would agree to a reasonable limitation of armaments; Sir Neville Henderson said the offer would not be considered *unless* the Polish question was settled."...Their rulers having thus most unhappily sown the wind, the people are now reaping the whirlwind.

But "it is never too late to mend". K. Zilliacus says (op. cit. p. 208): "In Imperial Policy, a Labour or People's Government would take immediate steps to come to terms with the Congress movement in India, on the basis of recognising India's right to self-determination, and to frame her own, or revise the existing constitution. in a Constituent Assembly, *in return* for Congress *pledging themselves* to bring a free India into an association for mutual defence and economic co-operation, based on the principles of the League Covenant". It will be noted that the Congress Working Committee's statement, (also quoted by Mr. W. B. Curry) uses almost the very words of the last sentence, and promises the

pledge suggested. Mr. Zilliacus closes his book with the sentence: "England cannot save herself by her exertions, *unless she saves the world by her example.*"

This last sentence means more than perhaps the author had in mind. It means that Britain will have to *teach herself* that 'Self-government means government by the Higher Self of the People, and not by their lower self; and further, will have to *help India*, and her Congress and Hindu Maha Sabha and Muslim League, *to learn* this fact. The fact, though more self-evident than any axiom of geometry, is yet *very difficult to learn*, as all history shows.

It should be stated here again, that no sane person in India wishes Hitler to win in this horrid War; but no more does any such person wish that India should remain in her present condition of bondage and 'Dependency'.

Lord Linlithgow said, in Calcutta, on 15-12-1940, in the course of his address to the Chambers of Commerce: "It has not been the fault of His Majesty's Government that matters are not further forward today. *They have done everything in their power* .. For the suggestions, that Indian political leaders and...parties should ... reach agreement among themselves,...His Majesty's Government have nothing but the fullest good-will and sympathy". Unfortunately, *every* party in India contradicts such statements categorically, though for different reasons; and facts and figures are available in plenty, often stated by Britons themselves, to justify the contradiction. To mention only one flagrant instance, it is well-known that, during the days of the Round Table Conferences, (1930—1932), Hindu and Muslim leaders met in Allahabad and arrived at an agreement on the percentages of elected representatives; and that the agreement was broken up by a cablegram from "His Majesty's Government" from Britain, next day, offering a higher percentage to the Muslims.

Mathematical tricks are futile and worse.

All these notions, though, of settling such difficulties by percentages, are mere glamour, a 'delusion and a snare'. Ethico-psychical diseases can never be cured by arithmetical devices. They can be cured only by ethico-psychical remedies, by Right Education of all concerned, in the Essentials of Genuine Civilisation. Worse than futile are these arithmetical tricks—worse, because they stimulate dishonesty in census operations, and frantic competition and use of lawless methods for making 'converts' and 'reconverts'.

It will be asked, "Who is to decide what these Essentials are?" The answer is, "Conferences of the best and wisest, from time to time". It may be asked again, "Who is to decide who are the best and wisest?" The answer is, "A duly educated general public and electorate." "But who is to educate them in the marks of goodness and wisdom". "The best and wisest". "A vicious circle". "No, a *virtuous* circle, like that of good seed and good fruit".¹ Wisdom is *science* plus *philanthropy*. Public Opinion instinctively recognises that fact, and has only to be diligently reminded to look for definite evidences of both these characteristics, in the whole past life of those whom it would elect, and not to go by mere electioneering promises. 'Goodness and wisdom', here, mean 'self-denial as well as experience and knowledge'.

What a good and wise Government can and should do.

A truly benevolent and wise Government, sincerely wishful of the welfare of the People, can and should do much more (a) to promote peace between the creeds, sense and knowledge of civic duties, cleanliness, morality, public health, public spirit, avoidance of over-population, the pursuit of sciences, good arts, useful industries; by Right cultural and vocational Education of all, young and old; and (b) to induce the best and wisest scientists of the day to 'confer' together in Conference, and formulate a Scheme for a better and wiser Social Organisation, which would help to promote general welfare, as above. Indian traditions hold up Rāma, Yūdhishthira, Ashoka, Akbar, and others, as, in various degrees, exemplary heads of such Governments; judging them with due regard to the world-conditions of their times. The ideal, always and everywhere, has been that the Ruler should be the *patrici princeps*, the first, the chief, the principal Father of the People; the actuality has, but too often, been that he has become the oppressor and devourer of the people.

Can the British Government say conscientiously that it has done for the Indian People what it has done for the British People; what the Japanese, Russian, American, German, Italian, or even Turkish, Italian, Chinese, Arabian, and Afghan Governments, with all their shortcomings, have done for the internal welfare of their respective Peoples? Compare the 'progress' which these peoples have made in the last few

¹ See App. A.

decades, (apart from the capitalism, sensualism, war-mentality, in other words, greed, lust, hate, which have, in most countries, been also allowed to grow up excessively, or have been deliberately cultivated, side by side, and have ruined all the progress), with the 'progress' which India has made in two *centuries*, under the British regime. When Lord Linlithgow says that "*His Majesty's Government have done everything in their power*", history adds, 'to drive the People into deep discontent'. They have, by their unwise administration, made the People crave for 'freedom' from it. They could and should have, by wise, benevolent, patriarchal administration, obliterated all distinction between 'foreigner' and 'native', and made the Indian People insist on maintaining the British connection for ever, in a genuine Indo-British Commonwealth. They have committed over again, the old old mistake of trying to change disaffection into affection by repressive measures; of creating 'affection' by 'beating'; though the simplest common sense says that disaffection and anger are only increased by such maltreatment, and that genuine affection and respect can be created only by wise, benevolent, far-sighted, gentle yet firm administration, which sincerely performs the 'promotive' functions of the state diligently, and thereby reduces the need for the exercise of the 'preventive' functions to a minimum.

Eminent Britons themselves, in and out of office, many Viceroy's of India among them, have often admitted that Britain has not fulfilled the *promises* made to India, that practice has been very different from profession. The Hindu and Muslim masses, though they are not yet 'independent' of their 'mis-leaders'; not 'freed' and emancipated from the pseudo-religious delusions imposed upon them by these; are, nevertheless, beginning to realise more and more widely and fully, that they are being played off against each other by various interested parties. The growing general discontent, with the present state of things generally, and the form of the government of the country specially, is becoming ever worse; and it *may* become much worse in its manifestations than merely annoying, if the present conditions continue. In the interests of high morals as well as far-sighted and sound politics, for the sake of justice, equity, and good conscience as well as expediency, in order to restore peace throughout the world as well as in India, it is eminently and urgently desirable

that the full Dominion Status of India should be recognised without delay.

A Letter from M. P.'s to the Indian People.

"A letter to the People of India", (London, 23-12-1940), signed by nine M. P.'s, "of all parties", urges that People to help Britain to defend human "freedom"; not suspect Britain of the policy of "*divide et impera*"; not waste energy on a "barren controversy whether the goal should be Dominion Status or Independence"; admits that "there is nothing very new in what we have written"; and winds up with the exhortation: "*join with us* in defeating Hitlerism; join with us, *thereafter*, in framing the terms of peace, and helping to *shape the course of the world*".

How can the Indian People help reading the same 'old diplomacy' in this letter, which says "nothing new"? How can the suspicions and discontents, created by eight decades of British administration of India, (to go no further back than 1857-'58), be dispelled in a moment by a letter like this, written under stress of special circumstances? If the M. P.'s sincerely desire that the 'barren controversy' should stop, they should advise, not the Indian People, but the British Government to declare full Dominion Status for India, with conditions, at once, as suggested before, and so give positive proof of their *act*-ual good faith, instead of diplomatically phrased vague promises. These have been dangled before the eyes of India for much too long. She has learned the value of them too well. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick." It is such sickness that has driven India to cry for 'complete independence' and think of 'separation'. If full Dominion Status is declared for India, no one here will even dream of separation. The 'barren controversy' will vanish as by magic. Whom the Mystery has brought together, no one would dream of putting asunder, if only the two would live together in sincere *inter*-dependence, and work together sincerely for each other's good, in mutual consultation. Up to three years ago, Mahatma Gandhi was saying that 'Complete independence' meant for him only 'full Dominion Status', 'the substance of independence'. He has been driven into his resent attitude and language only by the utter intransigence and 'diplomacy' of the British Cabinet.

As things are at present, what can India do to help Britain to ensure "safety for freedom for man", when she herself has been deprived of such freedom by Britain, and is

utterly helpless, powerless, resourceless ?

In the final exhortation, what does "join with *us*" mean ? Even if Britain should sincerely join India with herself, as equal partner, then, after "defeating Hitlerism", would Britain and India, by themselves, "shape the course of the world" ? Would not the other nations wish to say something also in the matter ? Are not the words likely to be suspected by the other nations, to mean that the rulers of Britain want, by themselves alone, to become World-dominators and "shape the course of the world" as *they* please ? Why should the "framing of the terms of peace" be deferred till *after* Britain has won the war and so is in a condition to *dictate* the terms ? Is not that the way to prolong the war ? Should not a rational scientific idea of "how the course of the world should be shaped" (in other words, of a New World Order) be put forward, *now, at once* ? Does not the proverb wisely say, 'Strike while the iron is hot' ? Has not humanity experienced, but too often, the fact that when the urgency has passed away, when the iron has cooled down, things slide back into the old ruts, the iron refuses to change its shape ? In a time of (apparent) peace and quiet, the official reply to public demands usually is : 'There is no cause to complain ; everything is going smoothly and nicely'. Or time-wasting and money-wasting devices, like Commissions and Committees to report, are adopted ; and they, having received their cue in the 'terms of reference', usually recommend, with show of immense industry, fatuously trifling alterations and shufflings of paltry details. In a time of trouble, it is : 'This is not the right time ; you must wait for a favorable atmosphere of peace and quiet ; it is not fine sentiment to try to drive bargains in difficult times'. It is reported that Sir Neville Henderson, in his last interview with Hitler, referred to above, used this very phrase, about 'favourable atmosphere' being absent, when Hitler proposed various terms for peace. The day for 'diplomatic phrases' and evasions has gone by. Even rulers are beginning to realise that 'frankness is the deepest diplomacy'. Heaven knows when they will truly realise that 'honesty is the best policy', also. Mr. Churchill has certainly the merit of being very frankly outspoken.

As to the decrial of 'bargaining', indeed, there is no need for *any selfish* bargaining on *any* side. What is needed is an arrangement for the *good* of *all*. If a Rational Scheme

of a *New World Order* is put forward, *now, at once*, a Scheme which would justly and equitably satisfy the righteous interests of all sections of Society in all countries, would that not put an end to the War, if anything (other than exhaustion of one or both belligerents) can? Why not do *now*, and save mankind from further and greater horrors, what you *will have to do, in any case*, tomorrow, as everybody is saying, after untold and untellable losses and agonies?

We have also to remember, as regards the *ad hominem* and *ad gustum* arguments, that every alliance, every treaty, between governments, for offence or defence, against another, is a 'bargaining', patently. In the course of the Budget debate in the Central Legislative Assembly, in November 1940, the President of the Muslim League, Mr. Jinnah, as M. L. A., asked the Government plainly, without mincing matters, over and over again, 'What do you give us in return for what you want from us?' And no other member, official or non-official, thought of objecting to this perfectly fair and reasonable question, on the score of its being 'bargaining'. In a previous interview with the Viceroy, Mr. Jinnah plainly told him in effect (as reported by the papers) that if becoming an Adviser to the Central Government, or a Member of an expanded Executive Council composed of members from all parties, meant only that they should become mere collectors of funds for the Government, without any substantial powers, he could not consent to the arrangement. Who can say that this was not a perfectly fair and sound position to take up? And it is the same as that of the Congress Working Committee, in principle, if not in detail.

**Give Guarantees now, of a New World Order,
and so end the War; if you wait, you prolong the war.**

A very noteworthy paragraph on the cover of Sir R. Acland's book, *Unser Kampf*, (1940), must be reproduced here: "The trouble about this war is that it is the second war to 'make the world safe for democracy' and 'fit for heroes to live in'. Some people think we can win through, with sacrifice all round of course, to a nice tidy little economic or military victory, on the basis of another set of *promises* made to us by the same sort of men as those who *did not keep the promises* last time. We cannot. No one has the right to assume that our own people will automatically sacrifice and suffer, fight and die, all over again, for *promises*. But, above all, we cannot stop this slaughter for *promises*."

We cannot hope to inspire the German people with the will to stop fighting,...to overthrow their own government in order to stop fighting...by *promises*. We made *promises* to them last time. This time we need to give to our own people, to neutral peoples, and above all to our enemies, some *guarantee* of a *New Order*. But what guarantee? We must *actually* take the first definite and unequivocal steps towards the *New World Order*, under the leadership of men who are known passionately and sincerely to desire it. And we must do this *before*, not after, we can hope to end the fighting. This book tells you why".

The National Herald (Lucknow), D/11-10-1939, reported, from its London office, that "Herr Hitler's 'peace offer', while universally held in suspicion, has occasioned a clamour for the clarification of *Britain's peace and war aims* from varied quarters...An increasing section demands immediate declaration of war aims .. (So prominent a person as) Mr. Lloyd George, the most inveterate opponent of the 'long-war-plan' so long as all peace avenues are not exhausted, suggested that a conference of World Powers is *better now, than after the carnage*." In vain.

The same issue also reported that "Mr. C. R. Attlee and Mr. Greenwood are pressing the Government that they should make known, before they make any official statement enunciating their policy, *how far* they are prepared to *meet Congress demands*. But the *excuse now* is that any such statement has got to be delayed owing to the present state of complete preoccupation with Herr Hitler's 'peace offer'..."

The Hindustan Times, D/26-1-1941, reports: "The pre-war world has gone...But *plans for a new and fairer post-war world* could not be left till peace-time and a start *must be made now*. These points were made by Mr. Attlee, (Lord Privy Seal), speaking at Oxford (on 24-1-1941)...He hoped that, after the war, securing of adequate food for all the people would be a permanent part of national policy. Britain would not be able to afford an 'idle rich' class and equally not be able to afford that those willing and able to work must be denied an opportunity...Our institutions worked not through perfection of machinery but through the existence of the will to make them work." This is all very excellent. "Now" and "not left till peace-time" are particularly good. But "must be made"—reduces them again to 'pious wishes'. It would have been much more helpful to the world at large, if

Mr. Attlee could have said, 'Plans for a better New World are being made *now*, and are such-and-such, in broad outline'.

Also, the same gentleman, when not in office, used to be sympathetic to, and occasionally speak up for, India. Thus :

"Mr. C. R. Attlee (Leader of the Labour Opposition in the House of Commons) in a broadcast last night (10-10-1940), said :...We are fighting to get security for ordinary people of all countries, including Germany...Therefore, Labour is taking full share in the fight against Hitlerism...Our strength is in freedom. We must keep freedom at home, *extend it to the empire*, and, when peace comes, we must ensure that it is a peace of justice" : (*National Herald*, Lucknow, 12-10-1940).

But since being taken into the Cabinet, with other Labor leaders, in order to bring Labor into harness properly for the war-effort, he and his Labor colleagues have become too much pre-occupied with the immediate details of the war-work, to think of the Indian problem, except as something to be postponed indefinitely. Yet if he and Mr. Greenwood and Mr. Bevin, and any other Laborite Ministers that there may be in the Cabinet, could persuade Mr. Churchill to "*extend freedom to the empire now and not leave it till peace-time*", that peace-time would, very probably, come now, at once, without delay.

Perhaps the Madness will not cease till the psychical and physical explosives have been completely exhausted, and the forms of the present phase of civilisation are all reduced to dust and ashes. Perhaps Nature ordains that the new Phoenix cannot arise except from the ashes of the old¹.

A Theosophical Prophecy.

¹ A rumour has been current within the Theosophical Society, from its earliest years. It is said to have its source in the statements of Madame H. P. Blavatsky. The rumour is that, if Britain fails to establish a genuine Indo-British Commonwealth, and, thereby, to harmonise East and West, and lay solidly the foundation of a World Commonwealth, then the leadership of the Human World would pass away from Britain, (so far given to her because of some special qualities of the Anglo-Saxon sub-race, one of the latest off-shoots of the Aryan Race) ; and some other nation would be given the chance ; by the Invisible Spiritual Hierarchy which guides human evolution, (Manu and Rshis, of the Hindus ; Quṭb and Auliyas, of the Muslims ; Sons of God, of the Christians), which most members of the Theosophical

The view of an Important English-edited Daily of India.

The Statesman (Calcutta), edited by Mr. W. A. Moore, has been writing some very fine articles latterly, in connection with the World War and the political situation in India. As this is going through the press, comes the issue dated 10. 1. 1941. Its editorial, "Shoulder our Responsibilities", makes a suggestion to the same effect as made in this chapter. But it makes that suggestion, in language to which the modern politician is much more accustomed, and with arguments based on considerations which appeal to the 'practical' as well as the 'idealist' type of mind; indeed, even more to the former; though the present writer must affirm and reaffirm his conviction, that what is regarded, with some depreciation, as 'idealism', today, is the better, the more far-sighted, the truer 'practicalism' of tomorrow.

Society believe in. The present writer heard confirmation of the rumour from Dr. Annie Besant. I think she has mentioned it somewhere, in her published writings also. She has said often, in private and in public, "If India becomes free, all the world will become free", "In India's freedom is the freedom of the World." Because of it, she pleaded hard, again and again, with the British Government and public, in the last two decades of her long life of noble selfless service to Humanity, for the establishment of such a genuine Indo-British Commonwealth. Confirmation of the truth of the rumour is now publicly available, in *The Mahatma Letters*, D/ 1880 to 1884, addressed to Mr. A.P. Sinnett (published in 1923, after Mr. Sinnett had passed away). The following two extracts will suffice here :

"Will you, or rather they", (i.e. some British critics), "never see the true meaning and explanation of that great wreck of desolation which has come to our land, and threatens all lands, yours first of all? It is *selfishness* and *exclusiveness* that killed ours, and it is selfishness and exclusiveness that will kill yours—which has, in addition, some other defects which I will not name": (p. 252). "The '*Indo-British Nation*' is the pulse I go by": (p. 381).

But in order that 'an Indo-British Nation', 'an Indo-British Commonwealth', may be, two sorts of 'freedom' are needed by each of the two factors. India has to *free herself* from her own grievous moral defects and vices (excessive

The *Statesman's* editorial envisages, in some detail, the prospect of this horrible war being prolonged into 1942, and war industries being almost all destroyed in Britain proper, as well as Germany. "The Nazis will be destroyed; but if Britain is bankrupted, as well as denuded of her industries, Asia, Africa, and even Australasia may sink into chaos. If we (of and in India) put forth a great combined effort now, then, when Europe has destroyed its own industries, we shall not only survive but come to Europe's aid. ... It is a vain idea that Europe's extremity will profit us later, unless we see in Europe the home of *fellow-citizens of the world*, and our future market. But this united effort is not possible, *unless the colour war ended*. India is geographically, numerically, and materially, a *central factor* in such a common effort. She cannot have a *secondary* place in it. *She is entitled to a Government controlling its own soil* which can co-operate freely with the Government of the United Kingdom and the other Dominions, *without having to take its orders* from a country and a Parliament six thousand miles away...The power of Parliament should be vested in the Viceroy. *India*

caste-and-creed as well as individualist selfishnesses, exclusivenesses, tyrannies), and *to be freed by Britain* from subjection; vices and subjection form a vicious circle. Britain has to *free herself* from her own great moral defects and vices of a different sort, (viz. excessive nationalist and capitalist selfishnesses, exclusivenesses, excessive greed of imperialistic power and pelf), and to *free India from subjection*; vices and enchainment of India also form a vicious circle.

To break such vicious circles, a *Deus ex Machina* is always needed; as a physician is needed by a patient whose diseases have formed vicious circles. The World War is acting as that terrible physician. The only medicine is 'a New World Order'. Kṛṣṇa says, in the *Gītā*, that when Dharma, (Law-Order-Right-Duty-Religion, i.e., *Social Organisation*, Varṇa-āśrama-Dharma, wherein alone, Law and Order etc., are possible) falls into confusion, into dis-organisation, and the balancing of rights-and-duties is upset, then a new Spiritual Influx occurs, to restore that Dharma, i.e., fresh *World Order*; to restore the *same* eternal, because essential and fundamental, *principles*, though, it may be, with *new applications to new forms*; to restore due balancing of rights-and-duties. See Appendix C.

should be declared a Dominion, and its relations with Britain should be conducted through the Dominion office and the Indian High Commissioner. If this is done, the Viceroy will be able to get a representative War Government. *The internal constitutional settlement will follow as soon as we can draw breath to consider it.* Through the wartime collaboration of former opponents, a large part of the difficulty between Princes, Moslems and Hindus, will be found to have disappeared".

As to the time this ghastly war is likely to last, so competent and well-informed an authority as the Prime Minister of Britain, Mr Churchill, has spoken of the likelihood of its continuing into 1943. The Australian War Minister Mr. Spender, on his way back from Egypt, said in an interview to the Associated Press, at Karachi on 8-1-1941, that "It is foolish to imagine that the defeat of Germany is going to be soon; but that she will be defeated is inevitable....The end can only be reached when the Germans are taught the lesson that the death and desolation that they have brought to other countries will be repaid tenfold; an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth are not enough".

It may be noted also that on 9-1-1941, at a meeting of British and Indian women, in Conway Hall in London, Vera Brittain, member of the Peace Pledge Union, said that "India is the acid test of our claim that we are fighting for democracy. Britain, therefore, is morally bound to admit India's claim of freedom". She supported India's demand for self-determination, and requested the release of political prisoners. Such events show how the better mind of the British People is working, in distinction from the mind of Britain's and India's rulers. All honor to the heroic women who met to give such expression to that nobler mind, even amidst the horrors of war raging in the great capital.

CHAPTER III

Preliminaries for the Second Suggestion.

Failures all round; Why?

Some preliminary considerations are needed to introduce the second suggestion. The Hindus and Muslims have so far failed to make peace with each other; the Indian People and the British have failed to come to terms with each other; the British have failed to make peace with the other nations and extend the "pax Britannica" over the face of the earth; Japan and China have failed to make peace with each other; every nation has failed to make genuine, sincere, permanent peace with any other; the League of Nations, which, it was hoped and thought, after the last Great War, would redeem that Mad Crime, (for which, the impartial historian holds *all* the belligerent Powers to be *guilty*; only, perhaps, some more, some less); would bring about the dawn of a day more glorious than the world had ever seen before; would realise the dream of "the warless Parliament of Man, the Federation of the world" — this League of Nations has failed most miserably to realise that great hope, and has suspended itself; because of the subtle 'diplomatic' policies of the 'Great Powers'.

In further detail, among Hindus, the touchables have failed to make peace with the 'untouchables', every 'caste' has failed to make real peace with any other 'caste'; among Muslims, Sunnis have failed to make peace with Shias, or any other sect with any other. On a world-wide scale, the failure of peace, the growth of conflict, has been growing worse and worse, between class and class, trade and trade, vocation and vocation, ruler and ruled, teacher and taught, even man and woman, even youth and age; though every living human being has been born of a man *and* a woman, and every old person has been young, and every young person wishes and hopes to become old. In short, every department; every aspect, of human life is full of abnormally excessive strife, all over the world.

What is the One main radical Cause of *all* these ridiculous, farcical, terribly tragical, failures of the current phase of 'civilisation'? Excessive lusts and greeds and hates, of course; but why have these become excessive, not been

regulated? *Because* human society is not properly 'organised for Peace'; *because* effective regulation of human passions is not possible without a Rational World Order, and there is no such World Order at work anywhere today. Yet to the plain man, the 'man in the street, it seems fairly obvious that to Organise for Peace is *much less expensive*, in time, trouble, labor, resources, human happiness, than to Organise for War and carry it on.

The new phrase—'A New World-Order.'

Such is the newest phrase for what was formerly called 'Social Organisation'. It has a fuller significance. It makes prominent the fact that the Organisation, the Order, has to be made co-extensive with the Human World. "*A New World Order*"; "Such Horrible War must not happen again"; "There will be no end to War, (economic, diplomatic, martial), unless and until a New World Order has been established". Such is the agonised cry, whispered or loud, now, everywhere, in every country, even while war is raging in east and west. The Collective Intelligence of Mankind, Public Opinion, the Mass-mind, Sub-Supra- or Un-Conscious Mind of 'Total-Man', Conscious Mind in the thoughtful far-seeing deep-seeing Few in every country, the Dynamism of Hegelo-Marxian Dialectic, the Elan Vital of Nature, the Oversoul of Humanity, the Evolutionary Urge of Omniscient and Omnipotent Matter—call it as you will—is reaching out everywhere, gropingly or deliberately, towards a New World Order, with the one wish, will, prayer, that "Such Horror may not happen again".

Russia believes that, within its boundaries, it has already 'established' a (much-changing) sample of such World Order. In the U. S. A., the sample at work there is called 'the New Deal'. Hitler, with Mussolini as his lieutenant, talks of establishing a New World Order, in the world of Europe. So does Mr. Churchill, too, in somewhat similar words. Both confine their aspirations to Europe, for the present. The British Under Secretary of State for Air, Capt. Balfour Stewart, said, in an Empire broadcast re war aims, on 4th November, 1940: "The British ought not to confine themselves to saying that Nazism, and all that it stands for, must be destroyed. Young men of the R. A. F.—Youth of the British Commonwealth Nations—are fighting to win the war, which must secure *a new shape of the world to come*.. (To these young men) we must look, *in shaping the world to come*", Readers may remember that a few years ago, Mr. Wells published a book

with the title *The Shape of Things to Come*. A New York cable, D/ 28th August, 1940, said: "Britain is not only fighting a war; she is going through a revolution, writes the *Boston Herald*. Perhaps the most remarkable thing is that, in the midst of beleaguered London, men of *intelligence and foresight* can see, calmly study, discuss, and even welcome this profound internal development. British thought is not entirely confined to military problems of the moment, crucial as they are; but is able, with its remarkable trait of self-detachment, to appraise the nations' long-term needs, and lay plans for meeting them. They give hope that a new Britain will arise, a Britain which, in its practical application of democracy, may outdistance the world".

The only false note in this para is struck by the word "outdistance". The writer should have said, "set an irresistibly worthy example to".

Mr. H. G. Wells' view of a New World Order.

The issues of May, 1940, of the weekly *Picture Post* of London, published three instalments of an article by Mr. H. G. Wells, entitled 'Unite or Perish'. Readers will remember that in 1939, some papers in India reproduced his article (published in the *Times* of London) on "A Declaration of the Rights of Man". He invited discussion. Some leading Britons joined in it. A small book, "*The Rights of Man, or What are we fighting for*", summing up the discussion, was published by Mr. Wells in April, 1940. The article in the *Picture Post* carries on the same work, of education of public opinion. It is an impassioned, utterly humanitarian, genuinely philanthropic, plea for the establishment of a New World Order which would make such wars impossible, in the future. Mr. Wells has published many other writings on the same subject, including a book which bears this very title, *A New World Order*. The first step towards this, Mr. Wells, on historical grounds, ardently believes to be a new "Declaration of the Rights of Man".

Lord Winterton inveighed against Mr. Wells, in the House of Commons, on 23-10-1940. It seems that Mr. Wells made the mistake of criticising, in strong language, some British persons in high civil and military office. He must have been carried away by the passion of his advocacy of what he so fervently believes to be the Right Path out of the present horrors. In consequence, he failed to observe certain 'diplomatic proprieties'. Massacres may be committed; towns, countries,

whole populations, may be devastated, plundered, ravished, ruined ; but prominent persons must not be spoken of impolitely.

Yet it is difficult for the prophet Jeremiah to pick and choose and speak soft words, with nice discrimination and apportionment of culpability and blamelessness. When a person is keenly sensitive to the miseries that are being inflicted upon the human world, he feels all those to be culpable, who, directly or indirectly, help the system that creates those miseries. It should also be remembered that Mr. Wells has often condemned Hitler and Mussolini in far stronger language ; *and*, (unless I am much mistaken) the particular remarks of Mr. Wells against certain British office-bearers, (which Lord Winterton resented) were made because he thought that the war was not being prosecuted efficiently by them, and he wanted it to be conducted more vigorously and effectively, in order that Hitler and Mussolini might be defeated quickly, and the horrors of the war brought to an early end. The many and repeated changes in the British Cabinet and in the personnel of the higher military staffs, seem, after all, to have justified Mr. Wells' strictures.

Mr. Churchill, Mr. Lloyd George, and others, especially Mr. Churchill, have themselves often used no less vigorous language against their (British) political opponents. Mr. Lloyd George, in a speech in Parliament, characterised the work of Mr. N. Chamberlain's Cabinet as "feeble, foolish, and faulty." Mr. Churchill became Prime Minister, soon after ; and other drastic changes in the Ministry followed.

Mr. Mander, M. P., put the whole ease in a nutshell, when he said that "he did not associate himself with what Mr. Wells said in the U. S. A., but one must bear in mind that he was a great Englishman with a great creative brain ; and that in spite of his unfortunate remarks, Mr. Wells had *also* given expression to *views* which carried the *whole-hearted* approbation of the *whole of this country*".¹

¹ Mr. W.B. Curry pays a generous tribute to Mr. H. G. Wells, in the foreword to his book, *The Case for Federal Union* : "There is nothing I can say in this book that has not been said before, by more eloquent pens than mine. H. G. Wells, for example, has been pegging away at this theme for more than a generation now, and he has said it better than I can ever say it. He is a writer to whom all who work for a more Sanely Organised World owe a greater debt than they

Mr Wells' Bona Fides.

While no doubt, Mr. Wells failed greatly in personal courtesies, his philanthropic motive is indubitable. This is proved by two facts. He is no less indignant against Hitler and Mussolini than Mr. Churchill is, though he does not hold the British Government to be free of blame for the present state of things; *vide* his article and his booklet mentioned above; another very fine booklet published by him slightly earlier, "*Travels of a Radical in Search of Hot Water*"; and other writings. He wants Hitler and Mussolini to be defeated in the present war, quite as much as any the most patriotic Briton does. And if even one tenth of the atrocities that have been reported by the papers, as having been committed by Nazis upon Jews and vanquished peoples, have really occurred (and many are vouched for by reliable eye-witnesses), then surely Nazism deserves to be effaced from the surface of the earth. But we must not forget that capitalist, militarist, and nationalist imperialism is much the same as Nazism-Fascism. The armies and police-forces of other European Powers, and latterly of Japan also, have behaved in not very different ways; especially during and immediately after 'conquests', *e.g.*, of Mexico and Peru, the gradual conquest of province after province of India, the two Americas generally, Egypt, and the other parts of Africa, Burma, Indo-China, the Pacific Islands, Korea, Manchukuo, the Chinese

can ever acknowledge. He has brought to the preaching of his message, all his magnificent gifts of imagination and enthusiasm, and the brilliantly illuminating phrase, and he has commanded a larger audience than I can ever hope to reach. (His work) *The Outline of History*, bought in millions of copies, taught the lesson as plainly as it can be taught, and it ended with a plain statement of the lesson of recent developments: "There can be no peace in all the World now but a *common peace*, no prosperity but a *common prosperity*...."

Prof. C.E.M. Joad writes: "So powerfully in the books of men like H.G. Wells and Bertrand Russell, so frequently in those of their numerous followers, have the ideals of a fuller and freer life for man been set before the public, that many of us find it difficult to believe that they should not have become universally familiar": *Liberty Today*, pp. 29, 30.

sea border, etc.¹ But Mr. Wells wants something more also. He wants—as not all ‘patriotic and nationalist British’, but certainly a large and growing number of thoughtful, far-seeing, humanist human beings, born and resident in Britain, as well as in many other countries, want, immediately—viz., that, after the present horrible wars in east and west are over; with the greatly changed conditions of communication, which have made literature, science, art, inventions, commerce, inter-national; with the abolition of all boundaries by the aeroplane and radio; with the immensely increased possibilities of reasonable *Co-operation*; with all this, these ‘patriotic’, ‘nationalistic’, ‘racialistic’, ‘religionistic’, ever-recurring, ever more destructive and dreadful Conflicts should be replaced by ‘Humanistic’, peaceful, *Co-operation*, all over the world. No country, no nation, can now stand by itself, plan for itself, and take care of itself alone, be *independent* of and *free* from others; all have to be *inter-*

¹ Mr. Hugh Dalton, M. P., (op. cit.) describes powerfully, (as have done many others), the monstrous atrocities committed by Hitler and his Nazis upon the Jews, and upon the Germans, suspected of differing in views from him in any way, and huddled into concentration camps. But he also criticises unsparingly the devious ways of the policies of successive British Cabinets; and leaves behind a strong impression, that Hitler’s mind, filled with a burning sense of the wrongs thought to be inflicted on Germany after the previous World War, was so worked upon by these policies, that it has become really unhinged; (Mr. Dalton calls him “this mentally diseased savage”, p. 90); that he is now obsessed by a sort of mania of rage, which is infecting all the Nazis, has flung all scruples and humane sentiments to the winds, and is acting as Lord Kitchener (whose words have been quoted before) thought and said has to be done in war. Other writers like Madam Tabouis, John Gunther, etc., have shown, directly or indirectly, how the elusive and corrupt ways of the French politicians also contributed towards this frightful outcome.

Incidentally, it may be noted that Mr. Dalton frequently uses expressions like ‘New World Order’, ‘World Society’, ‘Commonwealth of States’, ‘Federal Union’, and expresses (p. 164) the “hope that India may soon become a Dominion, in spite of present misunderstandings and muddled negotiations”.

dependent, *bound* to each other in the bonds of benevolent and reasonable Co-operation. Hence, "Unite—Or Perish".

The second fact is that he has secured the help of such a presumably very sober and very respectable person as Lord Sankey, for six years Lord Chancellor of England, to preside over a Committee for the thorough revision of his original draft of the Declaration of the Rights of Man. The Committee has finished its work, and the revised Declaration has been published at the end of the article above referred to.

Mr. Wells has again invited discussion, but has made the mistake of copy-writing the text of his article. He should, instead, have proclaimed that any body and every body was invited, to reprint and circulate as widely as possible. The copyright cannot apply to the Revised Declaration, however, presumably.

In response to Mr. Wells' public invitation of discussion, I sent to the *Picture Post*, (London) long ago, some suggestions, adding a list of 'Duties of Man', as Individual, and as Administrative Body or Government in each State or Country.¹ Heaven knows whether, in the awful war-conditions, that letter of mine has reached, or will reach, its destination, or be published there.

I have written here particularly about Mr. Wells' work to illustrate how the People's Higher Mind is working in Britain.

Some more quotations.

A few more quotations seem desirable to make. The *Manchester Guardian*, dated 30-10-1940, says: "Against the specious talk of *reconstruction*" (*of the world of Europe*) "with which Hitler is deluding those whom Germany has enslaved, we should set to work to *think out outlines* of the *positive programme*, to give an indication that responsible quarters here are *planning* ahead for *Europe as a whole*..... (Cabinet Minister) Mr. Bevin has said well that post-war reconstruction cannot be thought of only as affecting these islands, but as *international reconstruction*, which will take into account not only industrial interests but those of primary producers—agriculturists and peasants *of the world*...It is extremely important that we should encourage, as Mr. Bevin is

¹ See App. B, 'Mr. Wells' Declaration of the Rights of Man', as revised by Lord Sankey's Committee, and the present writer's 'Letter to the *Picture Post*' thereon.

doing, right thinking about the economic foundations of peace."

Mr. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, on 14 Nov. 1940, said, in the Canadian House of Commons, that "the Canadian and United States agreement of last August was part of the enduring foundation of a *New World Order* based on friendship and good-will".

Mr. Hugh Dalton, M. P., in his book, (op. cit.), says: "At the end of the war, we should have in mind two great purposes...(1) to prevent any aggression by any State: (2) to build a 'New World Order', in which there shall be no more war, but Peace, Plenty, and Justice for all mankind, with the fullest freedom for each which is consistent with a like freedom for others": (p. 131-132). "If, at the end of this war, a *World Society* or *Commonwealth of States* is formed, (its) economic tasks (will) consist in planning for abundance, for a just distribution of good things, and for a reasonable degree of economic security": (179). "The most monstrous evil of our times is mass unemployment... The *New World Order* will be judged according as this industrial disease is cured or not": (176) "It is not far to the Land of Heart's Desire, if we had the *will* to make the journey": (179).

"The Monstrous Evil of Unemployment"—

Its Causes.

Poverty-amidst-plenty, starvation-amidst-abundance, millions *un-employed* in east and west, famishing (in the east), unable to find work and bread; while millions of tons of coffee, corn, fruits, which would *nourish life*, have been burnt, rotted, flung into the sea, deliberately, by capitalists to raise prices and increase their money-gains—on the one hand; on the other hand, more millions of human beings malignantly *mis-employed*, as standing and reserve armies and armament-and-munition-makers, and, literally, many thousands of millions of pounds worth of human labor, frightfully *mis-spent*, year after year, in manufacturing things which *destroy life* and life's necessities and comforts, and in training up 'human' beings to more and more 'efficiently' destroy that life, of non-combatant men, women, and children, even more than that of combatants, and reduce whole cities to ruins; this is the amazing, revolting, revolt-causing, phenomenon of the modern phase of civilisation. The cause of it all is excessive Greed and very Artificial Finance, thinking in terms of money, and not of 'goods', food, clothes, shelter, and other necessities and comforts of life.

"Every country strives to attain a 'favourable balance'; by which it means a state of affairs in which exports exceed imports. Now, since every export from one country is, *ipso facto*, an import to another country, it follows that the total exports of the world, not merely *equal*..(but) they *are* the total imports of the world...A 'favorable balance' is a mathematical impossibility for *all* countries to attain simultaneously. It can be attained by one, only by compelling some other to have an 'unfavourable' balance. The existing economic policies of most states are immoral, because they are antisocial."¹

Even in those countries which succeed in securing a 'favorable' balance, that balance all goes really into the pockets of a comparatively few scheming and clever millionaire-financiers, such politicians as are their allies and in power, and their direct and indirect dependents, who, in some cases, include a considerable part of the population. These financiers have again to seek new enterprises and investments in other countries, for their ever-increasing stores of 'money,' which has to be sent abroad again. So the vicious circle keeps going. The few grow ever richer; the multitudes ever poorer. G. B. Shaw and others have shown the self-contradictory and suicidal futility, and the great mischievousness, of the whole process. M. Litvinoff was the Russian delegate at the World Economic Conference, which met at London in 1936, was inaugurated by Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, and ended in utter fiasco. Walking to and fro impatiently in a corridor, while the other delegates were wrangling away in the meeting-hall, he was asked by an interviewer why he was not taking part in the deliberations. He replied that it was no use trying to convince those 'madmen'; and that, in Russia, the old economics was dead. The rulers, financial and political, of each country, obsessed and governed by the old economics of 'money', fearful of an 'unfavourable' and greedy of a 'favourable' balance, went on raising tariff walls higher and higher, in competition against and answer to each other, and practising all sorts of tricks to 'beggar my neighbour'.

Tariff war, economic war, has led to the military war. After all, politics is rooted in economics. 'La Gloire,' Power (of command, of authority, of office), Wealth, Sex-urge, Play—all these are shoots and fruits from one root, viz., a comfortably filled stomach. Bread Power is the ultimate source of

¹ W. B. Curry, op. cit., 109.

Finance Power, Material Power, Science Power. Bread must be distributed equitably, if wars are to be avoided, and the other 'Powers' are to be fostered usefully and constructively ; not wastefully and destructively.

At this point, the reverse and complementary process comes in. While Politics is rooted in Economics, Economics is rooted in what we may call 'Domestics', (the nature of the 'house-hold' or 'domestic life—which is indeed the original etymological meaning of 'oiko-nomics) ; Domestics, in Psycho-physics, (the psychical and physical constitution, nature, character, of the individual) ; and Psycho-physics (to a considerable extent, for 'nature' cannot be wholly changed by 'nurture'), on Pedagogics (the nature and quality of the Education given). Education is the root ; civilisation, the fruit. As the one, such the other. And vice versa. A vicious, or a virtuous, circle—as you please to make it.

Briefly, Right Education, supplies the right *cultural*, intellectual, moral, Spiritual Bread, and also the right *vocational* knowledge, of the ways of securing, and *equitably* distributing, the Material Bread, viz. necessities, comforts, luxuries. Spiritual Power, (not priestcraft, but) benevolent philanthropic Spirituo-Material *Science* Power, through Right Education of young and old, fosters, guides, regulates, corrects and directs, Arms Power, Finance Power, Bread Power, Labor Power ; in short all the forms of Temporal or Civil and Military Power ; and makes sure of their *righteous* exercise.

The old Indian Scheme of Social Organisation provides for all this. But it fell on evil days ; into evil hands. Its custodians became selfish, corrupt, degenerate, lost understanding of its true significance, began to crave for and seized more than their due share. They grabbed all rights, shirked all duties. The same process, of the seizing of honor, (official) power, wealth, amusement, all, by a comparative few, and the loading of all duties and labor on to the backs of the many, has been repeated in the west, in the last few centuries. And now, "'Tis a mad world, my masters !". Who listens ! Still, some of us must go on persistently endeavouring to draw the world's attention to the Ancient Message, of the Principles which provide the most effective weapon for subduing this "most monstrous evil of our times, mass unemployment", as Mr. Dalton calls it ; a weapon in the shape of (a very old pattern for) a New World Order.¹

In the meanwhile, the Great Powers (Russia and America excepted, so far) have jumped into the maelstrom of this monstrous war, which has developed very new strategies, made obsolete the lessons learnt from, and defence-measures adopted after, the last Great War, and has been slaughtering more machines, money, and materials of all sorts than human beings, and more non-combatants than combatants, so far. The Small Powers, more and more of them, have been and are being sucked into, and shattered to pieces by, the whirl of its tremendous currents. Russia and America also, perhaps, will not be able to keep out altogether, for much longer. They are already involved indirectly; Russia, even directly, in respect of Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland. 'Neutrality' has come to mean acting as commissariats, and food-munitions-arms Supply Departments, for the active belligerents; with 'an eye to the main chance', always for themselves. Russia has already enlarged its territories by some hundreds of thousands of square miles. The U. S. A. has added 'lend and lease' to its 'cash and carry' business, in its relations with Britain.¹ One section of the people of the U. S. A. are beginning to regard Britain as a buckler, a bulwark, against possible German invasion. Another section, the 'isolationists', of whom Col. Lindbergh is a prominent

¹The *Hindustan Times*, 30-1-1941, reports that on 29-1-1941, the U. S. A. Treasury Secretary, Mr. Morgenthau, in his evidence before the Foreign Relations Committee, said that "if this (Lend and Lease) Bill does not pass the U. S. Congress, the British cannot continue to fight." It also reports to the effect that, on 28-1-1941, Mr. Hugh Dalton, M. P., now Minister of Economic Warfare, stated, in the House of Commons, facts and figures which make it clear that the U. S. A. is exporting to Russia, abnormal quantities of cotton, brass, copper, wheat, petroleum, oil, all which are being supplied by Russia to Germany. In the Spanish Civil War, 1936—1939, in which a million human beings are said to have been destroyed and many towns were laid in ruins; and in the Japanese war on China, which began in 1937 and is not yet over; the 'neutral non-interventionists', Germany, Italy, Russia, Britain, U. S. A., though at daggers drawn among themselves, yet all equally and impartially supplied the 'sinews' of war, of all sorts, and even soldiers and officers, as 'volunteers' etc., to both the fighting sides, to whom, too, they

representative, thinks such invasion, across the Atlantic, 'absolutely impossible', when it has been found impossible across the English Channel; *vide* his testimony, on 23-1-1941, before the House of Representatives Foreign Relations Committee.

Such is the actual maniacal preparation, of the western world, for a New World Order. The Sun will not arise except after the darkness of Night. The Human Mind will not see the simplest truth—that it is easier, *much less expensive in terms of money even*, to those to whom money as such is very dear, to Organise for Peace and maintain Peace, than to Organise for War and carry on War; will not see that "if Rightousness is achieved, all things else shall add themselves"; will not see, until the blinding veil of selfish passions has been torn away by vast agonies. The New World Order cannot be born into life, except out of the death of the current 'civilisation' in the New World War.

Some Indian Repercussions of the idea of a New World Order.

Pandit Jawahar Lal Mehru has been making India famliar with the new phrase. He introduced it into the Working Committee's statement, summarised before. Incidentally, Shri Satyamurti, Deputy Leader of the Congress Party in the Central Legislative Assembly, has also been caught by the new phrase. In his speech in that Assembly, on 11-11-1940, during the Budget debate, he asked, "What about India in the New World Order"? And Shri Bhulabhai Desai, Leader of the Congress Party and the Opposition, has also taken up the words. In his speech in the Assembly, on 20-11-1940, he said, "If the issue is—a World Order based on democracy, then India is intensely interested in it". The words are taken from the Congress Working Committee's statement (*vide* p. 23, *supra*). (Both these Indian leaders of note have gone into prison since). Such utterances give rise to some hope of the development, though late, of fore-sight and far-sight, hitherto very lacking, in our Indian leaders also.

were not really friendly, but, in some cases and ways, even inimical. Truly the ways of diplomat politicians and capitalist financiers are more inscrutable than those of Providence; and Nature loves the physical manure of mangled flesh and the psychical manure of groaning anguish.

'Native-Foreigner' vs. Humanity.

But Shri Satyamurti shortly took again to that blessed word 'freedom'. In four sentences of the speech he used the words 'free' and 'freedom', five times. It may be supposed that by 'freedom', he understands such freedom as the now warring nations of the west have — freedom to tear out each other's faces. Some friends say that freedom means that Indians should be free in India as Britons are in Britain, and the other western nationals are in their respective countries. Behold the nature of their Freedom! Other friends declare that 'freedom' means 'freedom from foreign domination'. One asks them if Assamis, Bengalis, Beharis, Avadhis, Do-abis, Punj-abis, Oorias, Madrasis, Keralis, Hyderabadis, Mysoris, Maharashtritis, Gujeratis, Rajputanis, Marwaris, Sindhis, Kashmiris, etc., are 'foreigners' to each other. And if they are, then are Benaresis and Allahabadis, or Hindus and Muslims of India, or Brahmans and Non-Brahmans, or Shias and Sunnis, or the people of any two neighbouring Indian districts, or towns, or streets, also 'foreigners' to each other or not. They make no reply; but indicate in other unmistakeable ways, that they think poorly of the questioner's intelligence.

These good and kind friends do not see that 'Freedom' and 'Complete Independence' are *not* the right words; that 'complete independence' is a complete myth and absurdity; that no living thing is or can be completely independent of other living things; that '*ordered Freedom*', nay, '*a New-World-Ordered-Freedom*', and co-equal '*Inter-Dependence*', are the right words. They are still bewitched by the glamour of provincialisms, nationalisms, racialisms, religionisms. They do not realise that the Human Race no longer requires these artificial divisions, which have outlived whatever use they may have had in the past. Their use, *now*, is only to cause conflicts and wars, and hinder human progress. The words 'foreigner' and 'native' should become more and more obsolete under the new world-conditions. Banī Ādam, 'the children of Adam' or Ādi-Manu; Mānavāh, 'the children of Manu'; *vasudha-ēva kutumbakam*, 'the Human Family'; these are the right ideas and the right words, always, and now especially. Different provinces, nations, races, religions, languages, etc., will, of course, continue to exist. But the 'ism', attached to each, needs to be eliminated

Skin-color vs. Heart-Quality.

The *color* of the *skin* is of no consequence; the *quality* of the *heart* is of every consequence. The racial or national or communal *label* matters nothing; the *character* matters everything. He who helps us, in the time of misfortune, is the true brother. The land which gives us livelihood is the true motherland. Differences and multiplicity of languages need not be, and cannot be, abolished, any more than multiplicity and differences of faces and figures and personalities; but unity of fundamental purposes, ends and aims of life, unity of understanding thereon, and co-operation in effort to achieve them, *can be*, and *ought to be*, striven after, by means of an archetypal World Order. In that only will true Freedom flourish.

CHAPTER IV

What is 'Freedom', 'A Better World', 'Swa-raj'?

We hear and read endless repetitions of the words 'Swa-raj', 'Freedom', 'Self-Government', 'Self-determination', 'A New Heaven and a New Earth', 'a Better World', 'a Reconstructed Society', 'World Reconstruction', 'a New Social Structure', 'a New World Order'. The question arises insistently: Why not put forward plainly whatever positive constructive ideas you have on the subject? Why not disclose the lines on which you would establish the New World Order, constitute the Swa-raj, shape the new heaven and the new earth? That would tell the world what exactly, in concrete application of it, you understand by 'freedom'. Why not place all your cards upon the table for all to see, and thus disarm all suspicion that you have got things up your sleeve? If you do so, you will prove your honesty, your sincerity, your wisdom. So long as you avoid doing so, you will always remain distrusted. Instead of talking *round and round* the thing, why not talk *the* thing? Instead of oratorical, sentimental, emotional phrases, which only arouse temporary gusts of cloudy enthusiasm and lead whole masses astray, why not set forth intelligible, discussable, 'practical' and 'practicable' schemes, which would appeal to steady, sober, lasting reason? Why not do *now*—and so put an end to the war—what every one, belligerents themselves included, say will *have* to be done, *must* be done, after the war? Why undergo all the horrors and agonies of a prolongation of the war, when they are avoidable?

The Deceitful Words and Ways of Dictators and Rulers.

Mere promises, that all pain and evil, all want and frustration, will be abolished from the face of the earth and every body made *free* and happy—such only give rise to the suspicion that the maker of the promises is either a fool or a knave, and more probably knave than fool.¹ When any

¹H. Laski, in *Liberty in the Modern State*, pp. 34-37, describes vigorously the ways of "the strong man who

one makes such promises, or even holds out hopes of such things, he must be asked to explain, in some detail, *how* he proposes to bring the millennium about, *how*, in what specific ways, he will use 'power', when he has got hold of it. 'Freedom' is about the most seductive of catchwords today. Whoever promises 'freedom' becomes a *popular hero*, and is the person most likely, if he is given the chance, to reduce all his followers to slavery.¹

promises immense improvements...," the would-be dictator who "promises a new heaven and a new earth", and beguiles the people till he has brought them into "a more evil variant of the old bondage...For men who are bewildered and unhappy, Fascism offers the anodyne that religious revivalism has so often brought. It is the supreme release from the gnawing canker of thought..."

¹President Roosevelt said, in the course of a broadcast on 30. 12. 1940, "The Nazis talk of a New Order in the World ; but what they have in mind is the worst tyranny, in which there is no liberty, no religion, no hope" Mr. Churchill and his colleagues have been talking also of "a New Order in the World." Hitler's retort has been already quoted, p. 16, *supra*. Critics point out that the countries which own *empires* have been *already doing* what they are saying that Hitler *will do* if he wins ; that it is a case of the thief crying 'stop thief', or of one of a gang laying all the blame on another of it, to divert attention. Germany's ambitions for World-Dominion since the days of Kaiser Wilhelm, in rivalry of Britain, are of course well-known. Bernhardi's book has been already referred to.

So far as the 'democratic' countries are concerned, French writers have been describing Britain as 'perfidious Albion'; and British writers have been exposing France's corruption, immorality, decadence. There has been no love lost between the U.S.A. and Britain either, in the past. The relations and the mutual distrust of India and Britain are patent. The arguments which British politicians advance, and the imputations they make against the politicians of other countries, these same have been and are being made by the latter against the former ; almost word for word. All these mutual suspicions and accusations would be set at rest, if they would all only state plainly, sitting at a round table—what sort of New World Order each proposes.

Restriction of Freedom inevitable in Society.

Let us dwell upon the word a little. After all the pros and cons have been threshed out over and over again, in endless spoken and written discussions, it remains behind that 'Freedom' is freedom to do as you please, *provided* you do not infringe the *similar* freedom of any and every other person. If an 'individual' were really 'solitary', (as the Supreme Universal Self is), he would be 'absolutely' free. He could say, 'I am the *mon-arch* of all I survey, for my right there is none (*else*) to dispute.' But if he lives and wishes to live with and among 'other individuals', his freedom at once becomes curtailed, relative to, limited by, that of the others. 'Complete independence' is impossible for an 'individual' who is a 'social' also. The old Sanskrit words put the whole thing in a nutshell. *Vichārah swa-tantrah; āchārah samaja-samaya-tantrah*; "Thought is self-dependent, i. e., free; conduct is society-convention-dependent," i. e., has to conform to the rules, the customs, the mutual understandings, of the society one wishes to live in. But the conventions and rules may change, have to be changed, do change, under the stress of new *thought* caused by changes of *dēsha-kāla-nimitta*, time-

To illustrate how distrust is created between India and Britain, we may quote another of the excellent editorials of the *Statesman*, (22. 1. 1941): "Industrialise your country, and the key of the future is in your hands—said Sir Alexander Roger a few days ago at Hyderabad. From elsewhere comes a different voice, which we feel sure is the voice of the bureaucracy. It is not easy, we are told, to start new industries. It is difficult to get expert mechanics and complicated machine tools in time of war. This is all too true; but when it was easy, not only did the bureaucracy not give encouragement to the industries vital in war time, but it never had any intention of doing so. Even in war time, if there was a will, there would be a way...We are already regretting the stark staring folly of the bureaucracy, which completely failed India in regard to industrial war preparations. Before the end of the present year, the equally stark staring folly of the present attitude will be evident to all...The extraordinary power of the bureaucracy in India, which has habitually thought of providing India with a government, but not at all of providing it with internal strength, is definitely an obstacle..."

place-and-circumstances. If the society has selfless, experienced, and wise guides and legislators, the changes take place peacefully; otherwise, violently. "Liberty is the one thing you cannot have, *unless* you give it to others equally". This at once sets up limitations to freedom. These limitations take on the form of *reciprocal* rights-and-duties. 'Law', (*legere*, to bind) binds together, (or *ought* to bind together, for it does not do so, properly, in any country, today), a *right to a corresponding duty*; and, with the bonds of these inseparable rights-and-duties, it binds (or should bind) together, human beings into a Society. Rights, all in the hands of a comparative few; Duties, all on the shoulders of the many, the masses; these cause vast unrest, rebellions, wars, revolutions.

Prof. H. Laski (of the University of London), respected leading worker of the Labor Party, says: "I mean by liberty, the absence of restraint upon the existence of *social conditions*, which, in modern civilisation, are the necessary guarantees of individual happiness".¹ The words "in modern civilisation" seem to be very much out of place; left in by oversight, perhaps.

'Modern civilisation' has no social conditions at all which guarantee individual happiness. Just the reverse. So far, they have guaranteed only Wars and Misery instead.² The sentence would acquire the meaning which surely the

¹Op. cit. p. 49.

²Laski himself says, with reference to the War of 1914-1918: "The war was a supreme expression of the insecurity which lay at the basis of our social system...It was born of... international anarchy; and this, in turn, was rooted in competing economic systems, driven, by their inner logic, to obtain by war, objectives they could not reach, or could not reach rapidly enough, by peaceful means."..."War was rooted in the nature of the European system"; Op. cit pp. 17, 18, 120. But it must not be forgotten, that behind, and deeper than, the economic conflict, as the main cause thereof, is the psycho-physiological or biological cause, excessive 'lust' and multiplication, too rapid growth of population, out of proportion to the growth of goods-production, at first. Now, that the goods-production has increased immensely, capitalist greed and militarist hunter's cidomania, and imperialist pride and

author intends, if these words are omitted altogether, or at most, are replaced by some such words as, 'in truly civilised or rational life', or 'in a genuine civilisation'. Any way, this definition of 'liberty' also immediately presupposes 'social conditions', i.e. a Society, in which human beings are bound together' by rights-and-duties. It comes to this, whichever way the problem is tackled, that Freedom, Liberty, acquires a real, specific, workable, practical and practicable meaning, only in the setting of a detailed Scheme of Society, a Social Structure, which assigns rights-and-duties rationally, scientifically, according to sex, age, temperament, capacity, vocational aptitude, needs, tastes, interests, etc.; which, in other words, *Organises Society for Peace*, in accordance with the laws and facts of psychology and physiology.

It is claimed here that the Ancient Indian Scheme of Individuo-Socialism is, in this sense, the most scientific so far discovered or invented by the human mind; and it is respectfully suggested to all concerned, that (a) either a better one should be placed before the public by any one who knows of any such, or (b) the Ancient Scheme should be duly considered, discussed, improved upon, and adopted, as the very old yet ever 'New World Order'. Its detailed applications will have to be amended, of course, from time to time, as needed; and, of course, too, the whole of it will be changed for a better one when such is discovered.

love of power and glory, have complicated and upset the normal adjustment between goods and consumers, which would have taken place otherwise; and have converted the populations into 'cannon-fodder'; have indeed been deliberately increasing the populations, in order to have more such 'cannon-fodder'; in 'diplomatic' phrase, 'man-power'. Perhaps, Nature or Nature's God, created these militarists, imperialists, capitalists, diplomatists, nationalists, as also the fanatic-religionists, for the same reason for which it created the wolves, tigers, sharks, eagles, and the other beasts and birds of prey; viz., to keep within bounds the numbers of the sheep, cattle, deer, small fish, and small birds. All this does *not* mean that all private capital, all private property, should be abolished. It only means that capital-ism should be abolished; and that private capital and property should be limited, regulated, and guided to such uses as are not anti-social.

Form of Society to be distinguished from form of Government.

'A new and better *Form of Society, of Social Structure*'—as distinguished from *forms of Government*—this idea is slowly being born into the world-mind, with awful travail. India has experienced all sorts of different *forms of Government*, ranging from mon-archy (hereditary, and also elective), through: 'an-archy' (like that of the Spartans), and oligarechy of many sorts, to republic, and even 'philosophic an-archy' or non-archy, (the antipodes of 'mob an-archy' or the law of the jungle). But it has, for thousands of years now, believed in a comparatively *stable Form of Society*, viz., 'the four-vocational-classes system, plus the four-individual-life-stages system, with just and equitable partition of rights-and-duties, work-and-wages' This system has been known as the 'Varṇa-āshrama-dharma'.¹ The four 'varṇas', or main broad vocational classes, have now degenerated into thousands of rigidly hereditary and mutually exclusive 'castes'; and the orderly regulation of the individual life in four successive stages has disappeared; hence all the degradation and confusion that have fallen upon India.

In these circumstances, to tell the people to run after a mere catch-word, 'Freedom', 'Complete Independence', Swaraj, seems to the feeble vision of at least some of us, to be a more serious mistake than the 'blunders', which Mahatma Gandhi has been admitting, from time to time, with magnanimous sincerity and humility. We feel that it is only because Mahatma Gandhi's heart is pure and saintly, that Providence has been neutralising all such blunders, saving him and the people from the full consequences of them, and even drawing some distinctly good results out of them.

Dangers of misunderstood Swaraj.

If Swaraj falls upon India, *without* previous widespread education in the 'definition of Swaraj,' i.e. explanation of its

¹See app. C; and the present writer's *Ancient vs. Modern Scientific Socialism*, and other works. A distinction is suggested in the former, between Society or Social Structure, State, and Government. Thus, U. S. A. and Britain have the republican and (limited) monarchical forms of government, respectively; but the social structure is capitalist or plutocratic or oligarchically 'democratic' in both. A Society plus a form of Government plus definite territorial limits, makes a State.

'content', its implications, its broad main details, its policies; without the consequent creation, throughout the country, of what a friend calls 'Swaraj-mindedness', i.e., the civic sense of the main rights-and-duties which will have to be exercised and discharged by each person and by groups of different temperaments and vocations; if Swaraj falls upon India without such preparation, then it will mean only civil war, worse than the recent one in Spain; it will mean mob-rule, an-anarchy, every man's hand against every other, rival adventurers, hungry for personal power, thirsty for dictatorship, making their intriguing or duped followers create dire turmoil all over the country.

Mahatma Gandhi has unquestionably been the greatest leader of India, during the last two decades, since the Amritsar Massacre of 1919. He has infused a peculiar spiritual quality and an unprecedented method of non-violence into political struggle, in a unique manner. He is deeply respected even by those who regard him as the enemy of their interests. He is revered with a religious reverence by the masses. He has poured new life into the Indian people by his methods. He has brought a marvellous awakening and sense of self-respect and consciousness of strength to them. But there is a great lack also in the lead he is giving. In consequence of that lack, there is grave danger of the whole fine work collapsing, and even of the new life running into very wrong channels and creating ruinous turmoil. He has greatly strengthened and quickened the previously slowly growing unity of 'heart', of *feeling*, throughout the country, in all sections of the people, which demands a radical change in the nature of the Government. But he has not succeeded in creating a similar unity of 'head', of *intelligence*, of clear *understanding*, as to the nature of the Government that should replace the present one. There is no common *understanding*, on this point, between him and even the Congress Working Committee, (on which subject more will be said later), which has accepted him as generalissimo. He has not succeeded, as he has himself often deplored, in creating any real substantial and widespread unity between Hindus and Muslims. Indeed, he has, (unconsciously of course), *weakened* such unity of *understanding* as formerly existed, when the Congress Creed stated the objective of the struggle as 'Self-Government along Colonial-lines'; weakened it by substituting the undefined word Swa-raj instead; which word, because of the lack of specific

explanation, is liable to, and has actually caused, and is causing, many and antagonistic misunderstandings.

A Vicious Circle and Its Solution.

As a consequence a very vicious circle has been set up. The misunderstanding and consequent dissensions, between Hindus and Muslims, are preventing the *Unity*, which is indispensable to win Swa-raj; and the privation of Swaraj is fostering the dissensions. Mahatma Gandhi, and most Congressmen, say that if Swaraj comes, dissensions will go. Others are convinced, like the present writer, that Swaraj will not come, unless and until dissensions go; and that they will go, if, and only if, a rational Scheme of Swaraj is placed before the country, which will give a reasonable *hope* to all sections, that all interests will be justly and equitably served by it.

Therefore, it is urged here that, whatever else may or may not be done to actively promote the achievement of Swaraj, this *additional* work, of *education* of the public, in the *main details* of the *nature* of *Swaraj* or a *New World Order*, in other words, in the nature and main broad details of *Ordered Freedom*, is absolutely indispensable.

The Crux in Political Science and Art.

And the very heart of the Better World and Sane World Order has ever been, and ever will be, that the persons elected to the Legislature and entrusted with the supreme power of making laws, shall be *good and wise*, selflessly *philanthropic and experienced*; who will, from time to time, as needed, make *good and wise laws*, which will *regulate* and '*order*' individual as well as associational 'liberty' or 'freedom', by means of equitable rights-and-duties, and will promote the 'general welfare'. For only good and wise laws can do so. And such laws can be made only by 'good and wise' legislators. Be it repeated here that 'good', as qualifying 'legislator' means 'self-denying'; not the sense in which 'quinine is good for fever', or 'cement is good for building-purposes'. Good' as qualifying 'law' may have the latter sense. The word 'wise' covers both senses. How to ensure the election of such—is the one problem of all problems in political science and art.

Its Solution.

It should be solved first and foremost, at all costs. The Ancient Indian books and traditions tell us how.¹ But they

¹See the present writer's *The Ethico-Psychological Crux in Political Science and Art*.

tell us also, that the ensuring of a constant supply of such legislators, is possible only in the setting of the fourfold Individuo-Social Organisation of individual as well as collective Human Life. Every 'individual' is a 'social' also. Every 'society' is a group of 'individuals' also. The happiness of Individual and Society are therefore inter-dependent. The life of each must be *organised*, and the two lives, of Individual and of Society, must be interwoven, as warp and woof. So only, by such 'Organisation for Peace' only, can both be made happy.

This does *not* mean that 'Society' or 'Individual' should be static. By no means. They have never been static; always been changing. But, in order that there may be *change*, there must be *something comparatively changeless, of which* there are changes. The clothes change; the body is comparatively changeless. The body changes slowly; the memory, the 'individuality', (some call it 'soul'), is comparatively changeless. The memories, 'individualities', 'personalities', slowly change, in form after form, in birth after birth; the core-soul, the 'I-consciousness' pure and simple; the Principle of all Life and Consciousness, (which wears, bears, does, *all* forms, names, acts; which lives, moves, and has Its being in all things; and in which all things live and move and have their being) *never* changes. It remains ever the Self-same. It is eternally, infinitely, all-pervadingly, *absolutely*, Changeless; ab-solv-ed from all change and limitation in time, space, motion; while all changes are *in* It and *relative* to It. So some believe, and all the scriptures, that mankind holds sacred, declare. Pure and Absolute 'Freedom'; 'Complete Independence', 'Unlimited Liberty'; 'Real and Ideal *Auto-matism*, Self-motion, Self-direction'; belongs to It Al-One, because there is None-Else, No-Other, than It, to compel and limit It. It is all, It includes all. The 'I', 'Autos', 'Etymon', 'Ātman', 'Self', the Ultimate Principle of Life and Consciousness', *includes* all finite, temporal, moving, changing things and selves, within its Eternity, Infinity, Immovability.

Arche-type and subordinate types.

Does not the Mind *include* all objects', potentially? The nature of the Mind, *as a whole*, is changeless; it has three main functions, knowing, desiring, acting. The degrees, and the permutations and combinations of these, change; and so create differences of main and subordinate human types, and endless variations of character. All sorts of egoist and altruist instincts,

all the seeds of all vices and all virtues, are ever present in the sub-and-supra-conscious factors of the Mind, of each mind. Any particular group of these, which rises up into the 'conscious', which becomes emphasised—that gives the 'character' to a person, or a group, or a whole nation, of persons. When persons speak of the 'psychology' of a person or a group or a nation changing, what happens is that only another group of impulses becomes patent, and throws the previously predominant group into latency. In the present case, a general model Form of Society, or Swa-raj, or World Order, can be, nay, is, permanent, as archetype. It includes possibility of and freedom for many subordinate variations within its four corners.¹

'Universal Self' and 'Individual Self'; 'We' and 'I'.

Unfortunately, most of us, at the present stage of human evolution, cannot recognise this *distinction*, which is simultaneous with *identity* of essence, between the Universal Self and the individual self, between absolute freedom and relative, limited, restricted, ordered freedom. Therefore they find it difficult to define 'freedom' properly. They are always getting confused between 'complete independence' or 'independence' and 'relative independence'.

For example, Prof. Laski, whose work has been referred to before, seems not to recognise any such thing as a Universal Self. He thinks that "that uniqueness of individuality, that sense that each of us is ultimately different from his fellows, that is the *ultimate* fact of human experience. ... The individual is real to himself, not by reason of the contacts he *shares* with others, but because he reaches those contacts through *channels* which *he alone* can know. His true self is the self that is i-sol-ated from his fellows, and *contributes* the fruits of isolated meditation to the *common good*, which collectively, they seek to bring into being"². All this is true—but only partially. It is but half-truth. The complementary half, which also is necessary to realise, for the very 'practical' purposes of rational, clear-sighted, administration of human affairs, will be seen when it is duly pondered: *Why* does

¹For detailed exposition of this idea, and its bearing upon the administration of human affairs, see the present writer's *The Science of the Self*, and other works. The Appendices of this book indicate the main ideas also.

²Op. cit., pp. 58-59.

any individual *share* any contacts with others? *How* does the notion of "he *alone*" arise? Does not 'alone' immediately include reference to 'others' also? *Why* and *how* does there come to be a *common good*? *Why* does any *i-sol-ated* individual wish to make any contribution to that *common good*? How and why does an *i-sol-ated* individual come to be born of a *pair* of human beings, each of whom has a *pair* of parents, *ad infinitum*. How and why comes there to be a family, a society; how any sympathy, any fellow-feeling, any mutual understanding, any co-operation, at all, between *i-sol-ated* in-divid-u-als? Prof: Laski recognises the facts of such 'common good', and of such 'collective seeking'; but yet insists that "the objects of wills *cannot*, in some *mystic* fashion, be fused into a higher unity some-how compounded of them all".¹ He cannot see that 'isolation' is no less 'mystic' than 'fusion'; that 'fusion' is no less 'familiar' and no more 'un-intelligible' than 'isolation'; that the 'We' is as much an immediate experience, as indubitable, powerful, *ultimate*, as the 'I'; that the Over-soul is no more and no less recondite than the 'under-soul', the single-and-particular soul; that the Mass-mind is as patent as the separate-mind. For the proper realisation of these facts the study of the 'super-physics' and 'psychics' of Yoga and Vedanta are desirable.

Lop-sided extra-version of vision.

Prof. Laski's vision, like that of so many other brilliant modern western minds, seems to be too much 'extra-vert', (a useful new word coined by the psycho-analysts, equivalent to the Skt. *bahir-mukha*, *parāg-dṛṣhti*), 'outward-turned', 'matter-minded'. Also, a number of western thinkers in the west are, today, suffering from a natural revolt, against the excesses, to which the doctrine, of 'sub-ordination of the individual to the state', has led, in the hands of 'totalitarian and authoritarian dictatorships'; the dictatorships into which 'equalitarian communism and socialism' have been transformed, by the jugglery of the 'D-evil in Man', who is perpetually managing to turn upside down what the 'Go (o)d in Man' devises.

Because of this lop-sided vision, thinkers often cannot see that individual self and Universal Self, proper good and Common Good, individual and Society (State), persons and the Impersonal details and Principles, special facts and general Laws, limited freedom and Absolute Freedom—that both the terms of each such pair are inter-dependent, are equally indispensable. Because of this, is there immense perplexity and confusion,

in political thinking; because of this are there perpetual upsets of internal and external balance, and consequent turmoil, upheavals, wars, revolutions.

The 'totalitarian State' has led to 'totalitarian war'. Mussolini, in his article on 'Fascism', in the *Enc. Italiana*, hymns the praise of War for the sake of War, and rhapsodises 'mystically' over "the State as an absolute". Hitler also trains a 'total' nation for war, with 'mystic' fervours. The 'reasons' behind both are different; and well-known to the 'democratic oligarchs'; who also prepare their 'total' nations for war, in their own 'diplomatic' and 'non-mystic' very shrewd ways, playing upon the sentiment of 'nationalism', as successfully as the others.

Each for all and all for each.

And all the while, the plain, simple, shining truth is: Neither is Man wholly for the State, nor the State wholly for Man; neither is Man wholly for himself, nor is the State wholly for itself; but each Man is for himself and for others, i. e., the State, the Society, also; and the State, the Society, is for itself, and for each Man also. In short: All for Each, and Each for All. 'I' is for 'We', 'We' for 'I'; each sensor and motor organ for the mind-body, the mind-body for each organ. Error always lies in the extremes; truth is always to be found in the golden mean. Of course, error, truth, extremes, golden mean, in human affairs, and, indeed, everywhere in the regions of the limited, are always relative, comparative.¹

¹Joad, in *Liberty Today*, pp. 186-188, says that the analogy, which some propound, between the State and the bodily organism is false. The reasons he adduces are not convincing. He says that the bodily organs cannot rebel against the body; as individuals can, against the Society or State. But, as a fact, they do. The special disease, weakness, atrophy, of a particular organ which has been neglected, maltreated, or given wrong nourishment, is its rebellion against the body. Man and State are interdependent, like body and organs, and have corporate as well as personal lives also. The cells, tissues, organs, of a body, also, have a 'private' as well as a 'public' life. The whole body lives for each organ; each organ lives for the whole body. The permanent loss of an organ leaves the whole body poorer; may even cause its death, if the organ is a vital one. Obviously, a

The book of Laski is brilliantly written. It is full of minute criticism of other people's views; full of statements of the pros and cons of public movements, and administrative measures adopted by persons in power, in different countries and times—all very interesting. But it is mostly

state or a society is not a physically integrated aggregate of individuals, in the same way in which a living organism is, of cells, tissues, organs. But there are biological and psychological bonds between the individuals; and the whole is integrated by a 'group-soul', an 'over-soul'. The subject belongs to 'super-physics' and 'meta-physics'. It is attempted to be dealt with, in modern western terms, in the present writers', *The Science of Peace*, pp. 268-274, 372, with reference to the nature and meaning of 'individuality'. Of course, the whole subject is meaningless and absurd to one who is sure that there are no forms or planes of matter possible, other than those which he can cognise with his physical senses.

Scientists have noted that "certain minute marine animals, called *Siphonidae*, normally grow until all organs are complete, so that digestion, propulsion, and sexual functions can be performed by each individual. But when several individuals meet, they attach themselves to each other, at first mechanically. But presently the union becomes organic. Individual *Siphonidae* surrender their separate entity, in order to become, as part of a larger mass, mere organs of propulsion, of sex, of digestion." They have also observed a 'communal mind' in a termitarium, the working of which depends upon the mere presence, in the nest, of the queen white ant. The analogy holds good, throughout all gregarious life; but, of course, only *generally*, not minutely. Herbert Spencer's monumental work on Sociology holds good permanently, despite 'corrections', in particulars, by subsequent writers. Some German writers have pursued the analogy even more minutely than he. A 'society' is *not* a mere collection of 'individuals'; like a heap of pebbles; though even that, in order to be a *heap*, has some 'unifying cause' behind it. A 'society' is an *organisation* of 'individuals'; and the organising 'principle' or 'idea' or however else you like to call it, constitutes its 'group-soul' or 'over-soul' or 'higher individuality'. Even so, the cells, tissues, organs, of a living organism are held together by its 'life-principle', 'soul', 'mind', 'ego'; and die, when the latter flits away, disappears, is extinguished.

only destructive criticism. It does not put forward any luminous, positive, constructive, definite general and special principles and ideas, which would give to Individual-and-Society, to the Society-of-Individuals, comparative peace and stability and *balance*, of powers, in the plural, internal as well as external, between the various sections and avocations - within each people or nation, as well as of power, in the singular, between all peoples or nations; which would not by any means attempt to preclude (as is impossible) all change; but would only endeavour to arrange that such change (which is fundamental to life) is not violent, but steady, gradual, peaceful, progressively evolutionary.

No way out except by World Organisation now.

The constructive ideas put forward in the book seem to be contained in two or three sentences of it: "Freedom is, in an important degree, a matter of *law*; but, in a degree not less important, it is a matter, also, of the *mores*" (morals, manners, constitution) "of the society, outside the sphere within which *law* can operate...Democracy of itself is no guarantee of freedom. This raises the large question, of whether freedom in the modern state can ever be satisfactorily secured by internal sanctions, and whether, in fact, it is ever durably possible, save in terms of a *strong International Organisation*...The way, therefore, of freedom is to arrange the pattern of *Social Institutions*, so that there are no privileges to sacrifice...Where there is *respect for reason*, there, also, is respect for freedom. And only respect for freedom can give final beauty to men's lives".¹ The book ends with this last sentence. It is all excellent sentiment. But the author does not give us any idea of what his own notions are, about the nature, form, pattern, of these *Social Institutions*, of this *strong International Organisation*, the *law*, and the *mores*, of *Society*, which will conform to *respect for reason*, and will be most helpful towards the security of freedom for man, individual and collective. It is obvious that 'pattern of social institutions', '*mores* of Society', are only other names for Social Organisation; 'International Organisation', for World Order; '*law*', for good and wise laws, to be made by good and wise elected legislators; '*respect for reason*', for the principle that Social Organisation, World Organisation, World Order, should be based on well-scrutinised, well-tested, scientific, psychological,

¹ Op. cit., pp. 65, 211, 212.

philosophical, *rational* principles, which would reconcile Individual and Society. The Ancient Indian Scheme of Individual-Socialism can supply all these desiderata, without imposing any cast-iron inflexible rigidity.¹

CHAPTER V.

The Great World Need : (a) A Model Social Organisation, and (b) A Common Heart of All Religions.

What the human world needs today ; what it is perishing for lack of ; is (a) a rational scientific scheme of principles of Universal Organisation for Peace and Prosperity and Progress in refined living, of all and every Human Society as such, which will give to all societies, nations, races, and religious communities, some main, broad, vitally important *common* features ; which common features will make it possible, and patently desirable, and also clearly *practicable*, for all, to co-operate in economic, protective, social, literary, and scientific matters, with each other ; while each would still preserve any specific distinguishing features it may cherish. Do not persons of the same family wear different dresses, but all speak the same language ? Has not every normal human face the same main features, though each face is also different from every other ?

Equally vitally does the Human Race need (b) a Universal Spiritual and at the same time Scientific Religion, which would be based on the same philosophical, scientific, psychophysical principles, laws and facts of Nature, particularly Human Nature, on which principles the Social Organisation should be based. This Universal Religion would *not* seek to supersede or abolish any of the great living religions that any great groups of human beings hold dear ; but would show to all, that all the religions include certain fundamental main beliefs, and also practices, which are the same in essence, in substance, and in the purpose of fulfilling certain radical human needs ; though each religion uses other names, other forms, other words of other languages ; and though each has some special and peculiar creeds and customs of its own too. All human beings could meet in such Religion ; while each person could, in his own home, cherish any particular creed he or she loved, or none at all.¹

¹Such views as I have gathered, from the old eastern literature, especially the Indian, on both these subjects, (a) World Order or Universal industrial-economical-political-

The World-Mind moving towards a World Religion also.

The World-Mind shows a growingly stronger tendency towards the unification, the fraternisation, the reconciliation, of all creeds, in and through a Core-Religion, a World-Faith; even as it is calling more and more loudly for the federation of all states in a Common World Order, a World Organisation, a World Federation.

It is well-known that a great Parliament of Religions was held in Chicago, in 1893; and that the same world-wide Urge of the Human Heart found expression and took shape in the great World Fellowship of Faiths that assembled during Chicago's second World's Fair, in 1933-34. The Fellowship held 83 settings, at which 199 spokesmen, of All Faiths, Races, and Countries, delivered 242 addresses. These are gathered together, classified, and published in a remarkable volume, entitled *World-Fellowship*, from which quotations have been made before (pp. 8,9). Every one who cares for the advance of humanity on the path of upward evolution, should read it. Speaker after speaker supplies material, directly or indirectly, for support of the plea made here, for the world-wide teaching, preaching, recognition, of the Common Core, the common head and heart, the Common Soul, of All Religions, throughout the world, as the *best foundation* for a common World-wide Social Organisation, the need for which also is stressed by many speakers.

Many large and small gatherings have been taking place in different countries, ever since 1893, with the same object. Another session of the Central World Congress of Faiths was held in London in 1936. A fairly large gathering, of representatives from many eastern and western countries, took place in Calcutta, in March 1937, under the name of the International Parliament of Religions. In 1939, there was a session of the Congress in Paris. In July 1940, even while the frightful war was raging, the annual meeting of the Congress was held in London, under the Chairmanship of Sir Francis Younghusband. Extracts from an article by him, and from another by a Buddhist Bhikku, about this last session, are

educational-social Organisation of the Human Race, and (b) Universal Spiritual-and-Scientific Religion—these views, I have essayed to expound fully, in several books, and, more briefly, over and over again, in scores of articles in the dailies and other journals, in English and Hindi.

quoted below, from the quarterly paper, *Theosophy in Action*, D/17-9-1940.

Inter-dependence of World Order and World Religion.

"Without recognition of the *Spiritual Unity* which lies at the Core of all Religions, there can be no real peace in the world; and Spiritual Unity can only be achieved by members of each religion recognising and honouring the truths contained in other faiths. The study of *Comparative Religion* leads to Spiritual Unity"...(For without such study there can be no real religious understanding; and) "Without religious understanding, there can be no achievement of the *Spiritual Unity* which should be the foundation of the *New World-Order*. It is to secure such religious understanding that the World Congress of Faiths has been established, chiefly through the influence of its Chairman, Sir Francis Young-husband. Its fifth annual session has recently been held at Bedford Lodge, London University, under the presidency of Lord Zetland. Members of different faiths attended...The subject for discussion was 'The *Common Spiritual Basis for International Order*'...Why should not members of all faiths ...try to understand one another?..Why should not they, each, attempt to distinguish the *essential* from the *non-essential* in the religions, and stress chiefly the essential?..." : Bhikku Thittila.

"This year's meeting of the World Congress of Faiths was held in London...We discussed the '*Common Spiritual Basis for International Order*'. Throughout the sessions there was a sense of the resurgence of the *Religious Spirit* and a toughening of the spiritual fibre. And this, we saw, would be the *very necessary base of any New World Order* which would arise in future. There must be a revival of Religion. But besides this, we must have a *clear and positive vision of What Kind of World we want to build*": Sir Francis Younghusband.

"The alternatives are (I) either (a) a policy of Righteousness and (b) a just Reorganisation of the World, or (II) an armed world": Sir S. Radhakrishnan.¹

The words "Common Spiritual Basis for International Order", and "the Religious Spirit is the very necessary base of any New World Order"—these words are worth pondering on. "Men do not live by Physical Bread alone"; they need

¹*Eastern Religions and Western Thought*, p. 254.

Spiritual Bread also. Human beings *cannot, will not*, live without *some* 'Religion'; *something* which will reach out to the *Hereafter* also; as well as help to strengthen and console the heart, and make the difficulties and problems of life *Here*, easier to bear, surmount, solve. Nor can they, will they, live without *some* sort of Society, Social Organisation, 'law and order', government, authoritative administration. The psychophysical constitution of human beings is such. Therefore distinctive 'religions' and distinctive 'civilisations', 'associations', 'societies', have always been born, grown, flourished, decayed, and died out, together. The tremendous growths, of science on the one hand, and of strife on the other, of Good as well as of Evil, in the first four decades of this century of the Christian era, and the expressions of the World-Mind in World-literature—all these unmistakeably point to the fact that a time of very great crisis, turning, change, has arrived in the evolution and history of Mankind. A New (*Revival* of the Eternal and Universal) World Religion, which will synthesise all religions; as well as the clear conception and active initiation of a rational, scientific, humanitarian New World Order, which will synthesise all nations, and all administrations; which will certainly *not abolish* separate 'governments', (better called 'administrations'), but will abolish the separate and '*in-dependent sovereignty*' of wholly separate 'national governments'; such a New World Order, also, has become indispensably necessary—to usher in an era of a New Civilisation, far finer than any yet known to history. These ruthless wars seem to be preparation for it. They are made unavoidable by the element of Evil in man's Nature. Even so, wild forest growths, now and then, have been, and have to be, destroyed by fire, when no milder methods avail, to make those tracts available for human cultivation and habitation.

Many readers will be aware that the Theosophical Society was founded in New York, in 1875. Later on, its headquarters were established at Adyar, Madras. The three objects of this T. S. are (a) to form a nucleus of the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, caste, color, or sex; (b) to encourage the study of Comparative Religion, Philosophy, and Science; (c) to investigate unexplained laws of Nature and the powers latent in Man.

The first object initiates and takes the first step towards, the World Organisation, through which alone Universal Brotherhood can be actually and practically realised. "*The*

Brotherhood of Man, so far from being a vague, sentimental aspiration, has become a definite *practical* doctrine. If only men could be startled into believing it, the Brotherhood of Man has become the *most practical* doctrine in the world, ...the *condition* of the *survival of Man*. The full realisation of this idea will demand certain *changes in Education*.¹

The second object leads to the recognition of the Essential Unity of all Religions, in a core of Spiritual Science and Scientific Spirituality, which constitutes the common head-and-heart-and-limbs of all the great living religions, (and, indeed, of the great dead religions, so far as known).² Such Spiritual Science, with its inseparable aspiration for a higher and more refined life, will be the very cement of the whole structure of the World Organisation. Be it remembered here, that the Religion, the Philosophy, the Science, which do not promote human welfare and happiness *Here* as well as *Hereafter*; which do not help to solve the problems of daily life in *this* world, and bring peace to the head, consolation to the heart, strength to the limbs, by assuring us of immortality *beyond* this world—such Religion, Philosophy, Science, are of no value, are worse than useless, are positively harmful. They are only formalism, ritualism, superstition, stultification of intelligence, and source of hatred between brother and brother; only arid logomachy, sterile jargon, wrangling scholasticism and barren academics; only cause of adding to human misery in many ways, chiefly by promoting excessive, aggressive, rank sensualism, and then bringing about the butchery of millions.

The third object leads to and opens up the long vistas of the higher and more refined life, and of far finer civilisation, which will become attainable for Mankind when that kingdom of heaven on earth, a Rational Philanthropic World Organisation, is established; a civilisation of mature wisdom, repose, peace, as well as of youthful eager restlessness, enterprise, power, guided by that wisdom; a civilisation beautified by subtler, wider-ranging, organs of cognition and action, making many instruments and machines unnecessary. In a condition of perpetual excessive war and practical anarchy, pervading all the world, even the Rshis and Yogis, the Mystics and Gnostics, the

¹W. B. Curry, *The Case for Federal Union*, pp. 106, 107.

²See H. P. Blavatsky's *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine*; also non-'mystical' western books on Comparative Religion.

Sāliks and Sūfis, the saints and scientists of 'mental matter', cannot pursue their very delicate researches in super-physical 'occult' science, and develope subtler organs and 'extend' their 'physical' and 'psychical' faculties.

A Word of Caution.

Let it be repeated here that Universal World Religion does *not exclude any* of the great living religions, but *includes them all*; just as the general concept 'Man', 'Humanity', does not exclude any, but includes all, particular individual human beings. 'It takes all kinds to make a world'. It takes many organs to make a organism. Eyes, ears, nose, tongue, skin, hands, feet, do not fight with each other. They all co-operate in ministering to the one-life of the individual. They all are nourished by that one-life in return. Even in the matter of handwriting, every writer has a different one, even as he has a different face, a different voice; yet they all write and speak the same words of the same language. All religions fit into the one Universal Religion. All are duly nourished by it. Why need they fight with one another? They should all join in subserving that World Religion.

The Painful Progress of Humanity.

The physiological organism and psychological individuality have grown, by integration of more and more cells and experiences, (cognitions, affections, conations), from the unicellular amoeba, to the human being composed of billions of cells and billions of mental functionings. Even so, Humanity has risen, in the course of thousands, some say hundreds of thousands, the Indian *Purāṇas* say millions, of years, from smaller physical group and mental concept to larger and larger.¹

¹ The current western view, as stated, for instance, in Wells' *Outline of History*, is that 'true man', with some sort of articulate speech, began about 50,000 years ago; and that cultivation of land and domestication of cattle began, in North Africa or Western Asia or in the valley now submerged under the Mediterranean sea. The *Purāṇas* and *The Secret Doctrine* indicate that many great civilisations successively flourished and perished, in the course of some *millions* of years, on different continents, which have risen out of and again sunk beneath the sea; that Noah's Deluge, Plato's account of the submergence of the

In known history, it has advanced, with cruel travail for the birth of each new and larger idea, from family to clan, tribe, sub-race, chieftaincy, principality, to nation, kingdom, race, empire, nationalism, racialism, imperialism. It has to advance yet farther, to Inter-nationalism, Inter-racialism, Federalism, Humanism, World Socialism, World Federation. It has advanced from worship of stone, tree, animal, human being, nature-forces, spirits of the air, water, fire, earth, sun, moon, planet, star, (*something* outside of one-self; which, because of the *faith* put in it by the *believer*, becomes, by reflex action, a source of actual mental strength to him); to that of a Being who is Supreme, but who is, at the same time, imagined, by each particular great group, to be attached only to one particular prophet or divine incarnation, and one particular form of religion, based on one particular book, in one particular language, and centred at one particular spot of earth. It has to advance from such particular religionism to Inter-religionism, to the Religion of Humanity, Humanist or rather Universalist Religion, to *realise* that the Supreme Being is *within us all*, as well as without us; is attached, not only to one, but equally to all such particular religions, books, languages, places; is, literally, All-pervading, All-Including, like Space, Time, Motion, which, indeed, are Its primal 'Mental' Forms; is the very Principle of Life and Consciousness, in which all things live and move and have their being, and which lives and moves and has its being in all things.

How that Advance can be quickened and made less painful.

Such advance can be facilitated and quickened greatly, if leaders and rulers, Church and State, *educators* and administrators, would sincerely co-operate, to spread broadcast, the right and righteous kind of teaching.

great island continent of Poseidonis, traditions of the sinking of the whole vast continent of Atlantis, with all its very highly advanced civilisation, which had begun to misuse physical and psychical science in worse ways than (as yet) the current western civilisation, and periodic great and small *pralayas* and *srshtis*, are very far from being utter myths. A recent book, Lord Raglan's *How Came Civilisation*, (1940), belittles archeologists' views, arguments, and inferences, and says that every known civilisation has been derived from an earlier one.

Humanity should be helped, actively and diligently, by them, to realise that, while different persons, bodies, faces, figures, words, languages, minds, souls, are necessary; the Impersonal or All-Personal including all persons, including all souls, the Universal Mind inspiring all minds, the Common Understanding running through all languages, the Common Thought behind many different forms of verbal expressions of it, the Common Arch-type Man of Humanity (called Manu or Adam), are at least equally necessary. It should be enabled to bring home to itself, that general Laws are equally necessary with special facts; Principles, with details; Common-Wealth, Public Possessions, Works, Properties, with private property and possessions; Socialism, with individualism; Humanism, with nationalism and racialism; World Religion, with particular religions; Spirituality (which is Altruism, in practice) and belief in the Universal all-pervading Spirit of all Life and Consciousness, with Materiality (which is Egoism, in practice) and special faiths and worships of special objects of love and reverence.

In other words, Mankind have to be helped to see and feel consciously, deliberately, that the time-tested, very old, fundamental, social institutions of Religion, Property, Family (Skt. Dharma, Artha, Kāma; Ar-Per. Dīn, Daulat, Dunyavilazzat) are indispensable, for the existence of the individual as such; but that at the same time, they have to be regulated, balanced, prevented from going beyond due bounds, from committing excesses, by laws which are equally indispensable, for the existence of Society as such. Nation-wide and World-wide Education in these truths (—even the *self-evident* axioms of geometry have to be *taught* to generation after generation—) is the only way to enable Mankind to see and feel thus, peacefully and cheerfully. The teaching has to be done, not dictatorially, but with invitation to discuss, and by patient explanation, persuasion, 'practical experimental object-lessons', and creating opportunities and conditions for the educands to make experiments for themselves.

Even as 'freedom' must not become unrestrained, but must be restricted by the equal freedom of others; so, families must not become too large, i.e., *population must be regulated*, must not exceed the capacities of the country to feed and clothe and maintain in decent living; should grow only as the resources of the land, to maintain it decently, grow; *individual property must be limited*, must not exceed due

proportions, must be kept within such bounds as will be in accord with 'general welfare'; *religions* must be so exercised and conducted, that the practicing of none shall conflict with the practicing of any other, and that the practices of all shall conform to at least the minimum requirements of very widely recognised morals, decency, and hygienic science; and finally, the *administration* of the affairs of each nation and each vocational group, section, class, within each nation, must be so conducted as not to injure the 'general welfare' and conflict with the just interests of any other nation or group.

How only the World-Synthesis can be achieved.

Such balancing, such regulation, such adjustment, reconciliation, synthesis, is possible only by means of a New World Order and an all-embracing World Religion working hand in hand, or, indeed, as Body and Soul (or Mind); and working through Education, first and foremost. The League of Nations failed and became sterile and indeed dead, because it was not married to a League of Religions.

It is submitted here, that the *principles* of the Oldest known World Order and the Oldest known World Religion are such as will form the best and strongest foundations of the New World Order and (revival of) the New World Religion.¹ It is the unhappy fate of Mankind that the birth of every Great Idea should need vast travail. The horrors of the World Wars were and are necessary to compel the rulers and leaders of the nations to turn their eyes in the right direction and see the simple all-illuminating truths. We cannot see the Sun itself, though it is shining on us all the time, if we stand with our backs to it.

To see why the two, World Order and World Religion, are indispensable, each to the other, consider the following quotation, from the work of a member of the British Parliament. "The situation which confronts us now" (*viz.*, the second World War), "has been brought about, because we have based all our public life, both national and international, on the principle of *selfishness*. If this is so, it surely suggests that we should be wise to look for our salvation in the adoption of an entirely different standard of morality... This conflict of economic with religious teaching...(*viz.*) 'all men should look after their own self-interest' and 'love your neighbour as yourself'...cannot be reconciled;...and as long as we live in a

¹See Appendix C.

society based upon this fundamental contradiction, we shall inevitably suffer from inequality, envy, malice, greed, and unending strife....The Church was bound to fail'...¹

The *Principles* of the ancient Indian World Order and World Religion above referred to, *solve* this fundamental contradiction; they *reconcile* the conflict of economic with religious teaching; *by regulating and restricting*, (not trying vainly to annihilate), all *selfishness*. They interpret Christ's teaching, 'Love your neighbour *as yourself*', to mean 'in equal degree with yourself'; not more than yourself, not to the extent of utter effacement of yourself, except in special circumstances. They supply the *Technique* of systematic Scientific Organisation and Interweaving of the Social Life and the Individual Life; the Technique without which the practical working of the Golden Rule is impossible. They provide due opportunities for the indulgence of the *egoistic* as well as the *altruistic* instincts of man, in such fashion that the exercise of both shall be pro-social, not anti-social. They tell us that Education is the root, and Civilisation is the fruit; and they declare to us the constituents of that Healthy Education which will produce a Healthy Civilisation.²

In pursuance of the plan followed in this book of placing the ancient ideas, which he believes in, before the public, in the better and more forceful language of modern western writers, as far as possible, the following quotations are made.

"Fundamental political and social change must doubtless be inaugurated by adults, but if this is to be permanent, it must be accompanied by *fundamental Educational change*. If our object is to produce a world which is cosmopolitan, rational, democratic, co-operative, and kindly, then our schools must be societies in which these virtues are embodied. The attitudes children acquire, are the result, not so much of exhortation, as of the values implicit in the Societies in which they grow up...The *connection between Education and the Social Order* is one of the few topics on which the progressives agree with

¹Sir R. Acland, M. P., *Unser Kampf*, pp. 30-39, (third impression, March 1940).

²See the present writer's *The Science of Social Organisation, or the Laws of Manu*, chs. III, IV, V, 'Problems of Education'; and *The Essential Unity of All Religions*, ch : VI, 'Education and the Educationist.'

the dictators. Hitler knows very well that if you treat children decently they will not become Nazis, and one of his first acts was to stamp out utterly the progressive education movement in Germany, which, between 1919 and 1933, had grown very rapidly... Erika Mann, in *School for Barbarians*, (has painted) a horrifying but balanced picture of education in Germany... In the state school...the Nazi propagandist found a not unfruitful soil".¹ It must, no doubt, be true, that the German militarists, full of the bitter spirit of *la revanche*, intensified by very great economic distress,² have been deliberately converting the younger generation of that country into 'war-dogs' and 'cannon-fodder'. But—have not *all* the other nations of Europe, including the British, been sedulously cultivating 'war-mentality' in their older and younger generations, a little more, or a little less?

This is what another British writer, very famous too, B. Russell, writes, of education in Britain primarily, and elsewhere also, secondarily: "Our world is a mad world...In spite of being well aware of the horrors of the next war, we continue to cultivate in the young, those sentiments which will make it inevitable...The cure for our problem is to make men sane; and to make men sane, they must *be educated sanely*."³

The more widely read, and more popular, H. G. Wells, writes:

"...Nature's remedy in the past (for deadlocks) has been a revolutionary convulsion. The only alternative is the organisation of a non-convulsive revolutionary movement...There must be a phase of *education, clarification, explanation*... Some such name as the New Radicalism, World Socialism, *Scientific World Organisation*, or World Radicalism, would best express its aims...It is necessary to re-establish a *sound basis of common general ideas*," (not mere catchwords like Better World, a New Heaven and a New Earth, Ramraj, Swaraj, Freedom, Complete Independence, Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, "To attain that (i. e. World Peace), I am convinced there has to be a world-wide *Re-Education* of mankind upon a common

¹W. B. Curry, *The Case for Federal Union*, pp. 207, 208.

²"Hitler's movement itself was mainly the consequence of economic disappointment rather than political resentment:" Sir Arthur Salter, quoted by Hugh Dalton, M. P., *Hitler's War*, p. 41.

³Bertrand Russell, quoted by Curry, op. cit., p. 199.

basis. Failing such a re-education, our present disorders will go from bad to worse, and that bright vision of a *World-wide Brotherhood* of active, happy, and upstanding human beings, which inspired us in the last century, will fade out of human imagination...In Burma as in India, the British Raj never explains. In effect it has nothing to explain. It is a brainless incubus. Its idea of *Education* has been to give imitation European University degrees by written examination...supplemented by a strenuous censorship of 'subversive literature'...In this Eastern world...the existing Imperial system is a paralysis rather than a rule...The contemporary British oligarchy...is a mental paralysis for India, and it blocks the way to any sincere federal association of the more genuine democracies of the world...All over the world where history is taught, the history that *separates*, prevails...*We want a Ruling Idea of a World in Common...* A steady campaign goes on to reduce literature, education, and intellectual activity generally, to the servitude of political propaganda...Nevertheless, the authentic writer and artist and scientific worker are the aristocrats of the human community. They are 'masters'. *Cher maître* is no idle compliment to them. They work on HONOR, and under no man's direction. They are subject to an inner necessity, to do the utmost that is in them...The plain need of the world is, *light, and more light...*"¹.

The Vicious Education and Literature of the present times.

Contrast with all this, the worship of national war-heroes and conquerors, and the 'national slogans', and songs, each extolling its own country, in comparison with, and in challenge of, all others, in every western country; and the neglect of the 'heroes' of wisdom, of science, of benevolence, charity, beneficent discovery and invention. Just think of the output, in the west, of the literature of the Sadistic, the Masochistic, the Lewd and the Lustful, the Monstrous, the Disgusting, the Horrible, the Bizarre, the Abnormal, the Fantastic, the Criminal, the Cunning and Deceitful, the Insane, the Psychopathic and Psychiatric, with which the world has been flooded during the last few decades. The present writer knows no other western language than the English; its literature is now full of works of this evil sort. The references, in these, to works in other western languages, of the same type, and translations, show that they are in the same case.

¹H. G. Wells, *Travels of a Radical*, pp. 71-78, 85, 120-121, 132, 144, 149.

The Consequence ; and the Remedy .

What *could* it all end in, but mass murder i. e. war, rape, loot, all sorts of crime and bestiality? A Sane World Religion and a Sane World Order, working hand in hand, are the only Physicians that can cure this vast and Dire Disease of the wholesale Insanity of Mankind.

It is as if a vast volcanic eruption, a cataclysmic earthquake, had completely broken up a whole continent, laid it in tumbled ruins, and covered it all up with cinders, ashes, lava, dirt of all sorts. All the 'mental' structures of settled ideas, and corresponding institutions, customs, practices, conventions, usages, lie shattered. The underworlds have yawned, and the legions of the Evil Half of the Human Mind ; the carnally selfish, the blindly egoist, cravings, appetites, instincts, of the sub-conscious element of it ; have broken loose from the hells in which they were confined and enchained, and have rushed to the surface. Only those two great Physicians, who, in co-operation, become mighty Magicians also, have the power to invoke and call out into the light, the shining hosts of the Good Half of that Mind ; the Spiritually unselfish and benevolent, the wisely, intelligently, rationally altruist, counter-urges, counter-impulses, counter-intuitions, of the supra-conscious element in that same Total Mind ; to battle with these forces of Evil, to subdue them, put them in such fetters as shall enable them to move to the orders of their wise wardens, and not run at their own will ; shall effectively prevent them from governing as despots, to the misery of mankind, and make them work as servants, for the general welfare of Humanity.

A powerful alterative medicine has to be given to the patient, Mankind, whose whole body-and-mind has become rotten with manifold diseases, due to intemperance, vice, utter confusion of thought, and Babel of tongues ; an alterative which will alter his whole bodily-and-mental constitution ; will re-generate, re-novate, re-juvenate it. The two Physician-Magicians who will administer it, have themselves to be evoked and invoked, like benign spirits, gods, angels, by assemblages and conferences of the most philanthropic as well as most experienced Wise Men and Women, Scientists, full of Spiritual as well as Material Science, versed deeply in and acquainted intimately with the Psychology as well as the Physiology of the Human Being.¹

¹See App. A.

The Hindu-Muslim Problem of India.

The Hindu-Muslim problem should be dealt with in this connection.

It is the trump card of the British Government in its game against India. It is being perpetually brought out to evade the demands of the Indian People. Mr. Amery, the present Secretary of State for India, and Lord Linlithgow, the Viceroy, have been making use of it, over and over again, latterly. 'Agree among yourselves, and we shall give you what you want—as soon as may be'; not even then 'at once'. 'To maintain peace between Hindus and Muslims is the sacred trust imposed upon the British Government, by the mandate of Providence.' One may well ask why the British Government does not request Russia to accept the 'sacred trust' from Providence, (or a 'mandate' from the syncopated League of Nations), of maintaining peace between Britain and Germany, and stopping these enormous 'political riots' that are raging between them, now. Of course the answer is plain: 'Russia is not strong enough; and might is right.' Perhaps Providence will make it strong enough; if things go on as at present for much longer, in east and west, and Britain fails altogether to do justice to herself and to India and others. But it is not yet too late.

Artificial exacerbation of the Problem.

In an article in the *Tribune*, London, (reproduced in the weekly *Mahratta*, of Poona, d/ 7-2-1941), Prof. H. Laski, referring to a recent utterance by Mr. Amery, wrote: "...The black spot in the Government's record remains in India..." As to why agreement is not arrived at, between Hindus and Muslims, the reasons have been indicated before. It has been and is being said, by thoughtful educated Muslims as well as Hindus and others, that the conflicts between the two are engineered by interested third parties, communal leaders as well as administrators. The fact that this is being said, is recognised implicitly even in the letter of the nine M. P's discussed before. That what is said is well-grounded, has been recognised by no less a person than Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, in his book, *The Awakening of India*. It was written after a tour of India, some twenty years before he became Prime Minister of Britain; and was proscribed by the authorities in India. "Sometimes the world's censorships achieve comedy, as when the Indian Government refuses to admit over the frontier some of the early publications of a

recent Prime Minister of Great Britain.”¹ The fact of the engineering has also been proved, by quotations from *Hansard*, and other official and non-official publications, in the Congress Enquiry Committee’s Report on the Cawnpore Communal Riots of 1931. That report was also proscribed by the Government of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh. But the ban was withdrawn, later, by the Congress Ministry, in 1938. Indeed, the fact is common property, and is being referred to in the journals and at public meetings, frequently. In the administration of India, in accordance with the requirements of the high policies of state-craft, which is the near kinsman of priestcraft, Hindus and Muslims are kept balancing each other.

The Balancing of Power, and of Powers.

Even so, perhaps, that most cunning of all administrators, Providence, has been keeping the ‘Great Powers’ of the human world, ‘balancing’ each other; particularly have the two Titans, Britain and Germany, been latterly played off by it against one another. These Great Powers, of today, are focussed in the astonishing figures of Hitler and Churchill—the ‘men of destiny’ of their respective countries; and in the equally astonishing figures of Stalin and Roosevelt, in the back-ground of the War. Roosevelt’s personality is especially amazing. Paralysed in the lower limbs from childhood by some severe illness, he has been bearing for two terms, successfully, the enormous burden of the Presidency of the U.S.A., and has now undertaken the tremendous strain of a third term, in times of exceptional difficulty and danger.

To Roosevelt and Stalin, Providence might delegate the function of balance-holder between Churchill and Hitler. But, (as this is being written, in the middle of February, 1941), the dailies are filled with indications, that they too are very likely to be dragged into the war, directly, one on each side; with Japan also, as ally of Germany and Russia; and the U.S.A., of Britain.

Mussolini, the panegyrist of War for War’s sake, who is described by Mr. Churchill, in his broadcast on 9. 2. 1941, as “the crafty, cold-blooded, black-hearted Italian, who sought to gain an empire on the cheap, by stabbing France in the back”, seems to be getting as much of the war as he wanted. Mr. Churchill did not mention the inhuman bombing and

¹H. Laski, *Liberty Today*, p. 7.

gassing of defenceless Abyssinians, nor the fact that Sir Samuel Hoare attempted seriously secret negotiations with Mussolini for the partition of Abyssinia between Italy and Britain; which negotiations, on disclosure, were stormily condemned and flung aside by the better mind of Britain. Mussolini's armies have met with severe defeats; in Albania at the hands of the Greeks; and in Africa, from the Indian, Australian, New Zealander, South African, and British forces; and have lost some two hundred thousand men, in killed, wounded, and prisoners, by the middle of February, 1941.

The Gratitude and the Promises of Politicians.

Incidentally, on that same evening of 9. 2. 1941, an "India Day function" was held in London, at which "Indian Army officers were guests...as a special mark of appreciation of, and thanks to, those sustaining India's honor in field and factory". At that function, Mr. Amery condescended to refer "to the remarkable steadiness of the Indian troops in the Middle East"; and said that they "had been given credit for the part they took in the lightning attack on Sidi Barrani, their leading part in the operations in Gallabat, ending with the headlong flight of the enemy, for pushing out the enemy from Kassala, and for scaling the heights of Agordat."

Reuter's telegram, d/-11. 2. 1941, (*Leader*, Allahabad, 13.2.41), tells more fully "A story of brilliant work and courageous fighting by Indian troops,...Punjab, Garhwal, Baluch, and Frontier regiments" ..(Muslims as well as Hindus)... "In December, General Wavell, in full recognition of the qualities of the Indian troops, came to the decision that they should be among the picked troops entrusted with the first and most vital move of the whole offensive—the attack on advanced Italian camps at Nibiewa, Tummar, and Sidi Barrani...Thanks to the Indian troops, the attack succeeded beyond all hopes...Throughout the first days of the desert *blitzkrieg*, Indians fought almost continuously...Indian Engineers and sappers concentrated on the dangerous work of removing Italian mines...along the coast road between Mersa Matruk and Sidi Barrani, throwing open the road to British transports taking vital supplies..." Another long telegram, d/- New Delhi, 11. 2. 41, says "Mahratta troops have been playing a leading part in the...penetration into Abyssinia... In a raid,...on Jan. 12,...a Mahratta company made a dashing attack,...shouting their battle-cry, *Shivā-jī Mahārāj kī jai*..." And the telegram describes a number of individual

deeds of heroism, of Mahratta soldiers, who, though mortally or severely wounded, continued to work their automatic gun or throw grenades, till they fell dead, or, on their ammunition being exhausted, were carried away by stretcher-bearers. An editorial, in the *Statesman*, 18. 2. 1941, gives high praise to the "important work, done by the quiet and unostentatious competence of the Indian Army Ordnance Corps, staffed almost entirely by Indians," to which work is due "a substantial part of the spectacular successes" achieved "by the valour of the Indian troops in North Africa ..of which so much has been written."

The achievements of Indian troops, fighting to save Britain and France, in the previous World-War, were similar, judged from the military standpoint only. A number of Indian soldiers won the Victoria Cross. Lord Hardinge, ex-Viceroy of India, said afterwards, in the British Parliament, that had it not been for the seventy thousand Indian soldiers who allowed themselves to be wiped out on the fields of Flanders, the German army would have succeeded in seizing Paris in its first rush. About a hundred thousand Indian soldiers, mostly Sikhs, gave up their lives in Gallipoli, and, (if I remember rightly, it was General Sir Ian Hamilton who reported that), all had fallen 'face forward'. But the 'reward' of India was--various Black Acts in the beginning of 1919, then the Amritsar Massacre in April of that year, and Martial Law horrors. It was this that drove Mahatma Gandhi and India into Non-co-operation and Civil Disobedience and Satyagraha of various kinds.

The Colonial forces, side by side with whom the Indian forces fought, on many fields, in appreciation and commemoration of that comradeship, coined the word 'Anzac', out of the initials of Australia, New Zealand, India, Africa, and Canada. But, shortly after the war, the 'I' was dropped, and only 'Anzac' remained.

Such are the gratitude and the promises of the diplomats in power. Of course, in the deepest sense, the Indian People deserve what they have got, because of their own sins. But so, too, do the European Peoples. Nature, or Nature's God, is teaching all, through suffering, to give up the Vice of internal dissensions, and acquire the Virtue of sympathetic co-operation.

Sins come home.

Mussolini is being found out by his sins. The middle of February, 1941, sees him inviting Hitler's armies into Italy for

help. Many thousands of Italian prisoners have been brought to India. The sins of France have been visited upon her since eight months earlier. Marshal Petain and other French officers are reported to have said, in effect: 'Too much shirking of family-responsibility, too few children, too much pleasure-seeking, too much internal corruption of all sorts, too much embezzlement of public funds, too little help from Allies, too many internal dissensions—these have caused the ruin of France.' The sin of Britain and Germany is over-multiplication and too much imperialist greed and pride.

Those who cannot rule themselves morally, with stern discipline, self-control, self-denial; who are swayed by the immediate selfish paltry personal gain, and do not see the very great general loss which will ultimately and surely envelope them and their descendants also; who have not the wisdom, the common sense, to fraternise and co-operate among themselves, in a reasonable organisation of the collective life of the community; such shall be ruled by others. This has been the fate of India; and of nation after nation. India has to relearn her Ancient Wisdom, and recover her Self-knowledge and Self-respect, whence only will true Self-government come to her. She seems to have made a beginning—very one-sided and imperfect as yet.

The British-German Problem of Europe.

The Duel of the Titans.

The tremendous tourney of Europe is, at the moment, left wholly to those two doughty knights, Churchill and Hitler. Unable, so far, to invade Britain directly, Hitler has declared (30-1-1941) his determination that "wherever we can strike at Britain we shall strike". The result is that, for the sake of Britain, in order to make opportunity for Hitler to strike at Britain, one after another of the other countries is being voluntarily or involuntarily sacrificed, is being subjugated and occupied, by German armies, while Churchill and Hitler have been challenging each other in genuine medieval fashion.

Hitler has been making offers of peace, (vide his speech 30-1-1941), on his own terms, of course; and without any of the usual military secrecy, has been quite openly giving specific warning of his next move, in case of refusal of those terms. The terms have been treated with contempt, by Churchill, equally of course. A gigantic invasion of Britain has been talked of, and seems to be getting actively prepared for, in Germany, in March-April. The rejoinder from Britain has been

that "the invaders would have to run back quicker than they come." A counter-invasion of Germany has been talked of by British Ministers. The reply of Hitler is: "I have read on several occasions, that the English intend to start a general offensive somewhere. I would ask them to let me know about it beforehand. I would then have that area in Europe evacuated. I would gladly spare them the difficulties of landing; and we would express our views again, using the only language they understand." He has also plainly announced that "This spring we will begin a U-boat warfare, and our enemies will then feel we were not asleep." Some months back, (as reported by the London papers), he expressed his determination to "drive the British pirates from their lairs in Gibraltar, Malta, Singapore, etc."

In this very speech of his, above referred to, he said that "American scholars entrusted by President Roosevelt with the task of examining the causes of the World War had established that Germany was free from guilt;...that the British Empire was created in three hundred years of brute force. War after war was waged by Britain." He is now trying to follow in the footsteps of Britain, to catch up with her, thrust her aside from her Empire, and either establish World-dominion for Germany (as Bernhardt outlined quite frankly), or bring about a Reconstruction of the World on the lines of 'Nationalist-Socialism', (now abbreviated into Na-Z-ism, Nat-S-ism), and Churchill's reply has been an expression of similar determination to annihilate "Hitlerism and all that it means".

Chivalrous Exchanges of Compliments.

So the war progresses; and the lions and tigers of the land, eagles of the air, submarine sharks, and mighty cachalot whales of the ocean-surface, of each side, from time to time, praise those of the other side, for great feats of skill and daring, in dive-bombing especially; while the leaders on each side say, in every successive speech, that their country is stronger and better prepared for war than ever before. The same old elemental anima-l-primitive everlasting passions and gestures, in articulate and intelligent (but not rational) expression.

On 31-1-1941, "The German air expert, General Milch, explaining to the German public, on the Berlin wireless, the difficulties of aerial defence, said: 'Already in 1918, the English airmen were the best in the world, apart from the Germans. *The English are a German race*, and they are fighters like ourselves.'..." This was naturally the highest

compliment that a German could give to a Briton. On the other hand, hymns of hate are also being sung on each side against the other.

"Germany and England"

A very remarkable book, *Germany and England*, was published in Britain, in June, 1914, after the death of the author, Prof: Cramb, in October, 1913. He too idealises "the higher spiritual elements in war and in Empire," like Mussolini, but with more chivalrous sentiment, and refinement of language, and tries "to make it clear that the hostility to England, now more or less prevalent among educated Germans, arises from no mere envy of the prestige and the advantages of our Empire, but from the fact that this Empire appears to them the main, even the sole, obstacle to the attainment of a great national ideal, for which they are bound to labor, and, if need be, to contend": (Preface by Prof: A. C. Bradley). "Since the days of Frederick the Great, while England, *largely by force of arms*, has been extending her imperial power over the world...Germany has remained cooped up within her narrow boundaries... Germany has rendered vast services, and maintained a leadership, (as Prof: Cramb says) 'in all the phases and departments of human life and energy, in religion, poetry, science, art, politics, and social endeavour'. Germany has cherished what Professor Cramb designates as 'a dream of world dominion', not simply a material, but a spiritual one, which shall make the *German mind*, the German genius, and the German character *prevail all over the world*. To this end, her poets, orators, historians, publicists, politicians," (foremost among them Trietschke the historian, Nietzsche the poet-philosopher, General Bernhardt the soldier), "have been perpetually drilling into the minds and hearts of the German people, from Kaiser to peasant, the duty and necessity of achieving this lofty ambition...The one insuperable obstacle...was the actual world empire of Great Britain... Prof: Cramb (describes) the general aim of British imperialism as, 'To give all men within its bounds an *English mind*; to give all who come within its sway, the power to look at the things of man's life...from the standpoint of an Englishman'...": (Introduction, by the Hon. Joseph Choate, U. S. Ambassador to Great Britain; and p. 125).

The common sense of every reader will supplement these poetic and idealist causes of the conflict, as of rival 'Kultur-s',

with the more prosaic, and much more acutely and powerfully stimulating, Biologic and Economic causes of it, viz., rivalries in 'market-grabbings', 'territory-seizings', 'colony-ownings', 'population-increasings'. Thus the German nation, a nation of philosophers, scientists, poets, musicians, archeologists, orientalists, scholars in every department of learning, of world-fame, was transformed into a nation of 'blonde savages' and 'supermen' with 'will-to-power' overriding all else, empire-hungry aggressors, rivalling the British, and possessed, besides, of 'German thoroughness', (an expression frequently used by British writers); transformed within four decades from the battle of Sedan and the unification of Germany by Bismarck, 'the man of blood and iron.' The previous World War became inevitable.

The last words of Prof: Cramb's book are: "And if the dire event of a war with Germany—if it *is* a dire event—should ever occur, there shall be seen upon this earth a conflict which, beyond all others, will recall that description of the great Greek Wars:

Heroes in battle with heroes,
And above them the wrathful gods.

"And one can imagine the ancient mighty deity of all the Teutonic kindred, throned above the clouds, looking serenely down upon that conflict, upon his favorite children, the English and the Germans, locked in a death-struggle, smiling upon the heroism of that struggle, the heroism of the children of Odin the War-god!"

It all reads well, in epic language, when the reader or writer is sitting at ease, well-fed and well-clothed, in a safe house, like Odin above the clouds. But, it is fairly certain that Prof: Cramb himself, would not have been able to "look serenely", upon the new trench-warfare, hospitals filled with gassed men, devastated towns in France, if he had lived to see the previous World War; or if he had been hiding, in the present War, in an underground shelter, on half-rations, suffering from pneumonia, with whole great streets of London and other great and famous cities of Britain, France, and Germany reduced to masses of debris, and non-combatant children, women, men compelled by Odin's mighty children, the rulers of the nations, to meet the fate of heroes.

A remarkable sentence of the book, near its end, (p. 134) is: "He who cannot take within his range a prostrate France and the alliance of Russia and Germany against England,

is not a student of politics, whatever else he may be". This forecast was not justified in the previous war; but half of it has been in the present, and the other half seems likely to be, also; with the further addition of U. S. A. and Japan, one on each side; while the rest, the smaller fry, and the 'colored' peoples, serve as food for the Titans. Because the previous War did not end war, did not die into a real Peace, did not lead to a New World Order; this New World War has come, inevitably; and the Titans are again at each other's throats, with Idealist professions and Economist practices. Even so, in India, on a much smaller scale, in a more sordid manner, large sections of Hindus and Muslims, misled by their leaders, are mixing up 'religion' with the crumbs of office, worldly power, preference, privileges, and above all else pelf.

Nature covers up and hides away death and ugliness quickly; and 'human nature', wittingly or unconsciously, forgets, puts away, 'represses' and 'suppresses', pains, unpleasantnesses, shocks, as soon and as completely as possible, while it cherishes cheerful memories diligently. Nature's wise provision; otherwise human beings could not live at all. The western world cherishes, and rightly, the remnants of Greek literature and Greek statuary, and speaks of "the Glory that was Greece". Yet, after completing the perusal of Thucydides' famous History, the reader may well exclaim, 'the Treachery, the Butchery, the Slavery that was Greece'. The feeling after finishing Tacitus' equally famous History of Rome is similar.

The Grinding of the Peoples.

While these chivalrous amenities, as well as hymns of hate, are being exchanged between the members of the High Command and their entourage, on each side of the war, and the 'living' but 'death-dealing' horrible cinema is whirling on with dazing and benumbing rapidity, the peoples of Britain and Germany, France and Italy, and many another smaller and weaker people, are being flung about helplessly, and bled white, by unheard-of nerve racking and economic drain, in this war of nerves, of propagandist lies, of attrition, of economic exhaustion, of blockade, of machines and scientific inventions, of civilians more than of soldiers.

Even so, in India, while the communal leaders, more sordidly, issue challenges and counter-challenges to each other; receive ovations wherever they go, deliver speeches to crowded

meetings ; and, consciously or unconsciously, mislead their followers away from the true teachings of their respective religions ; themselves hypnotised, and hypnotising others, by catchword 'denominational' names, Hindu, Muslim, Shia, Sunni, Brahman, non-Brahman, etc. ; as the European political leaders hypnotise themselves, and their peoples, by catchword 'national' names, Briton, German, French, Italian, etc. ; while the 'leaders' are doing this, their respective followers have become, and are becoming more and more, like two armed camps, with all the disturbance of, and estrangement and unhappiness in, daily life, which that inevitably means. The communalistic virus has been introduced into the public services, by the Government's acceptance of 'the principle of proportionate representation of the two communities', irrespective of superiority in the qualifications needed for the work. The religion professed has become a special qualification, or disqualification, as the case may be, for any and every post. The inevitable result is that the belief of the general public in the impartiality, fair play, and trustworthiness, of even the judiciary, much more of the executive, has become insidiously undermined. Each succeeding communal riot threatens to become worse than the preceding ; like the wars in Europe.

Economic Drain.

Economic drain has been spoken of above. If we take the human world as a whole, then such drain means only the diversion of a vast amount of human labor, from the production of 'goods' to the production of 'bads' ; the cruel misemployment of human power, for the indiscriminate destruction of the greatest works of utilitarian as well as fine art, instead of the right use of it for the construction of still more numerous and still nobler works of both kinds ; the unspeakably criminal misuse of human energy for the creation of the implements of agonised death, instead of the means of fuller and finer life. In terms of 'money', if a people were self-sufficient in the matter of food, clothing, and other barest necessities of life, and could spare, from the production of these, enough labor, and had enough raw materials, in their own country, of the kinds needed for modern war, to manufacture all the needed weapons and munitions ; then the words 'economic drain' would mean, to them, only loss of comforts and luxuries, as distinguished from necessities. The tribes of the North-West Frontier of India muster about two hundred and fifty thousand

rifles between them. They have been securing these rifles, and a few hundred cartridges for each rifle, for about a hundred rupees per rifle—so it is reported—from European countries, including Britain, in various ways, known to the 'experts' in such business. And they have been keeping actively employed, for many years now, a powerfully mechanised force of forty to fifty thousand British and Indian soldiers; which force, by officially disclosed figures, (the Secretariat only knows what the 'secret' figures are), normally costs the Government of India about eleven crores of rupees annually; besides over a lakh of rupees *per day*, or, say, four crores annually, over and above the eleven crores, during the last five years or so, during which it has been carrying on active operations against a rather mysterious person called 'the Faqir of Ipi', without succeeding in making him *hors de combat*, for a wonder. (This lakh of rupees per day is independent of the *twenty* lakhs per day which the present war is costing India, as the U. P. Governor said in a public speech, vide *Hindustan Times*, 22-2-1941. He also said at the same time, that it is costing Britain *twenty crores* of rupees a day). Some say the Faqir is being helped 'diplomatically' by some 'Great Power' or 'Powers'; others, that the British Government has not really cared to smash him, for these Frontier operations serve to train the British-Indian forces and keep them in fighting trim.

'Economic drain' acquires a very painful significance, however, when a country at war has to buy necessities as well as war-'goods' (or 'bads') from other countries, and has to 'ration', and stint in, its food and clothing; as both British and Germany find themselves compelled to do now; or when a country is 'compelled' to part with its 'necessaries' to support another country's war-operations; as those countries of Europe which have been subjugated by Hitler for the time being. It is well-known that, after the previous World War, in the winter of 1918-1919, India suffered from a terrible epidemic of what was called 'war-fever'. In four *months* and a half she lost *six* millions of lives, by Government statistics. A high officer of the Indian Medical Service, (Col: Brocksley, Inspector-General of Hospitals, in Bengal, if I remember rightly), immediately after retiring from service, published a pamphlet in which he put the figure at *twelve* millions and a half, or as much as Europe lost in killed, in four *years* and a quarter. The epidemic was due to the privation

of necessities, for the population, (already suffering from the consequence of excessive numbers), which was caused by the enormous export of raw as well as manufactured materials of all kinds, down to straw and cattle-fodder, for the use of the British and Allied armies. The loss in numbers was, however, more than made up in the next decade, by the thriftless excessive multiplication; and the general poverty, especially in the villages, has increased in consequent of that, as well as the steady annual drain of 'wealth' to Britain, in direct and indirect ways.

The Urgent Need of Agreement, in Europe, and in India.

If Britain and Germany could arrive at an agreement among themselves, that would give a happier, a wiser, Constitution, a New World Order, to the whole human world; and India's Hindu-Muslim as well as British-Indian problems would also be solved automatically thereby. For, it seems that, now, after nearly a year and a half of ever-mounting rage, and ever more fierce and furious war, a peaceful agreement is not possible without a radical change, in both countries, and along the same lines, to a New Social Structure; which the Mass-mind, in both countries, seems to be beginning to crave for, consciously, now, where it was wanting it sub-consciously, more or less, formerly. The crushing burdens and horrors of the War seem to be gradually freeing that Mass-Mind from the glamour and hypnosis which has been imposed upon it by 'nationalist' and 'patriotic', deliberately or sincerely lying and deceiving, propaganda. (Shakespeare has told the world about a person coming to "believe in his own lies" sincerely; and the 'diplomats' of all countries are adepts in such 'believing').

If, in the pursuit of Chamberlain's 'appeasement' and Hitler's 'revisionist' policies, the British Government had conceded Hitler's final demand, viz., for the return of Germany's colonies, this New World War would probably have been avoided. But, then, the hypnotic fascination would also probably have gained a new lease of life, would not have been exorcised; and the lesson of the urgency of a New World Order would not have been brought home to the belligerent and other peoples; and the Old Order would have continued for some time longer; until its inherent antagonisms brought about the inevitable World War. So, perhaps, the Mystery decided to

harden the hearts of British and German rulers, and plunged them into War, to quicken the process of change.

The leaders and rulers on both sides are making abundant and repeated promises of a Better World ; compelled thereto by the moods of the Mass-mind. But, because their hearts are not yet pure and sincere ; because they have themselves not yet imbibed the lesson of the War sufficiently ; therefore they yet continue to evade the questions that are being put to them, day after day, on behalf of the public, and to hide their war aims and peace aims under the cloak of 'diplomatic' language. Therefore, the war must last, until the hearts have had the hardness crushed out of them. Not until the D-evil has been driven out of them, can Go(o)d enter into them, in the shape of a Spiritual Religion and a Rational World Organisation.

Mrs. Annie Prophecy, in 1917.

Twenty-three years ago, as elected President of the Indian National Congress, in the course of her presidential address, to the annual session of the Congress, at Calcutta, in December, 1917, Mrs. Annie Besant, (of whom, after her passing, in 1933, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, famous orator, herself an ex-president of the Congress, said that "if Annie Besant had not been, Gandhi-ji could not be")—Mrs. Besant said :

"The Great War (begun in 1914), into the whirlpool of which nation after nation has been drawn, has entered on its fourth year. The rigid censorship which has been established, makes it impossible for any, outside the circle of Governments, to forecast its duration ; but to me, speaking for a moment not as a politician, but as a student of spiritual laws, to me its end is sure. For the true object of this war is to prove the evil of, and to destroy, autocracy and the enslavement of one nation by another, and to place on sure foundations the God-given right to self-rule and self-development of every nation, and so far as is consistent with the welfare of the larger self of the nation.

"The new civilisation of righteousness and justice, and therefore of brotherhood, of ordered liberty, of peace, of happiness, cannot be built up until the elements are removed which have brought the old civilisation crashing about our ears. Therefore is it necessary that the war shall be fought out to its appointed end, and that no premature peace shall leave its object unattained.

"Autocracy and bureaucracy must perish utterly, in east and west, and, in order that their germs may not re-sprout

in the future, they must be discredited in the minds of men. They must be proved to be less efficient than the government of free peoples, even in their favorite game of war; and their iron machinery—which at first brings outer prosperity and success—must be shown to be less lasting and effective than the living and flexible organisations of democratic peoples. They must be proved a failure before the world, so that the glamour of superficial success may be destroyed for ever. They have had their day and their place in evolution, and have done their educative work. Now they are out-of-date, unfit for survival, and must vanish away."

The wish and the forecast of Mrs. Besant were not fulfilled then. A very bad "premature peace" was made a year later. "The true object of the war" was left "unattained." Therefore this new War has come inevitably. "Therefore is it necessary that it shall be fought out to its appointed end"—in a New World Order. What Mrs. Besant saw and said more than twenty years ago, Jawaharlal Nehru, and a few others, in India, have begun to realise within the last few years, with wider study, travel, and experience, viz., the unavoidable connection of India, and the need to link it up with, a World-wide Social Organisation.

If Britain and Germany cannot make peace rationally; if they are not persuaded to do so by some 'benevolent', 'philanthropic', and powerful neutral, or semi-neutral, like the U. S. A. or Russia; if either country persists in saying, 'Peace on *my* terms only', or 'No talk of peace until complete victory'; if either insists on seeing only virtues in itself, and only vices in the other; then the process of blood-letting must continue, in the way of medieval leeches; until the mania passes from the heads of both, and of many another war-minded country.

Merits and Demerits on either side.

Many books have been published recently, in Britain, which describe, from different standpoints, the 'inveterately involved' intricacies of European policies, the amazing and ever more rapid moves of the pieces on the international chess-board, and the rights and the wrongs of the several countries and their rulers. They do so in connection with the current War and its causes; the relations between Britain and France after the previous World War; between the two, on the one hand, and Germany, Italy, and other powers, on the other; the rise and the doings of Hitler and the Nazis, and the actions

and reactions of British and French Ministers and the Russian Dictator. To arrive at a balanced, judicial-minded, impartial view, (so far as possible in the overwhelming circumstances), the books quoted from, thus far, have been found by the present writer, within his very limited reading, to be particularly helpful. They indicate, directly or indirectly, the merits as well as the demerits of the belligerents on both sides of the war. Others, of similar value, will be referred to, as occasion arises.

The 'frightfulness' of the sentiments as well as the actual doings of the Nazis, as described by British writers, and shown in English translations of German writings, (e.g., the many extracts by E. O. Lorimer, in *What Hitler Wants*, 1939; and the few by C. E. M. Joad, in *Liberty Today*, 1938), is, no doubt, extremely revolting, amidst the conditions of modern civilisation, in times of peace; and may well make the coldest blood boil with rage. Yet these constitute Hitler's preparation of the Mass-mind of Germany, and the training and 'fleshing' of 'war-dogs,' for the war, made inevitable by the present Social System and the imperialist intransigence of Britain; and there has been similar, if milder, preparation of sentiment in Britain and other countries also; in Italy, almost worse than in Germany; in Russia, by bloody 'purges.' In Spain, there has been a civil war in the course of which, far worse, and far more extensive and intensive horrors have been perpetrated than have been, by the Nazis, in pre-war Germany.

The losses, privations, tortures, deaths, which men of every nation inflict upon human beings, in every war, are much the same, more or less. Rape, murder, plunder, arson, complete destruction of flourishing towns, have been done by the armies of nation after nation, throughout the ages. Millions of peaceful citizens have been massacred by single 'conquerors'. The stream of red blood runs on every page of history, with Rudra-Kālī dancing their orgiastic macabre dance on its banks all along. India and Persia are full of the ruins of vast towns, destroyed, with their inhabitants, by invaders. The 'forgotten empire' of Vijaya-nagar, in South India, flourished so recently as in the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries, A. C., and witnessed a great efflorescence of Samskr̥t literature. The vast 'ruins of Hampi', now mark the site of the capital. By the accounts of Italian, Portuguese, and Afghan visitors, its size, wealth, and population, and

also prostitution and slaughter and consumption of enormous quantities of flesh, fowl, and fish (and presumably alcohol too, though not mentioned by the travellers) almost rivalled that of the western capitals of today. All was destroyed by war, between Hindu and Muslim kings, within a few months. Excessive luxury and arrogance on the one hand, and greed, jealousy, hatred, on the other, were the cause. Ghazni, enriched, beautified, adorned magnificently, by Mahmud, with the vast loot from India, in the eleventh century, was, a hundred and fifty years later, sacked, burnt, and destroyed utterly by Alauddin Ghorī *Jahān-soz* (the 'world-burner'), a Muslim like Mahmud. The marvellous gold and silver towns of the Peruvian and Mexican kingdoms have disappeared in ruins—together with the pyramids of skulls, made out of 'religious' human sacrifices, under the greedy, and also unconsciously avenging, heel of the European 'conquerors'.

The same eruption, of the same basic, brutish, passions, is occurring in the west and the near east of India, and, on a mean and petty scale, in the communal riots of India. The absence of that true Religion which would enable men and women to recognise and feel that the *same* Principle of Life and Consciousness animates them all; would help them to control and regulate those brutal egoist passions, by means of the technique of a Social Organisation which would justly balance egoism and altruism in the scales of Humanism; would thereby check the unregulated riot and revel of these passions; which are disguised by the very clever but very short-sighted diplomats, of all countries, under the grandiose names of 'patriotism' and 'national greatness', (which, doubtless, did useful work in the past, by lifting men's minds and hearts to larger concepts and wider sympathies, but are only deceitful and disastrous now); it is this lack of True Religion which is the real cause of all these great and small conflicts¹.

The police of every nation, more or less, torture accused. 'Question, of the first, second, third, degree', in U.S.A., is notorious; but is by no means confined to that great country. The 'lynch-law' of U.S.A. is even more notorious; and is

¹The present writer has attempted to deal at some length, in the light of old Indian thought, with these egoist and altruist passions, which constitute the pulsing heart of human life, its motive-force, in his book, *The Science of the Emotions*.

not very different from Jew-pogroms. Russia has its OGPU; Germany its Gestapo; Britain its S.S. (Secret Service) and (in India) its C.I.D. (Criminal Intelligence Department). Ill-treatment of accused in police-stations, and of prisoners in jails and 'concentration-camps', is not unknown to India, even in the British regime; though it may have only very rarely reached the extremes of the Nazi-atrocities. Undoubtedly, so far as we know in India, the record of the police in Britain itself, is the cleanest and finest; if not altogether free from stain; for there have been hushed-up scandals in London, not very long ago. Reports of Committees and Commissions, appointed by the British-Indian Government, have themselves admitted serious corruption in, and oppression by, the police and the jail staff.

Race-prejudice, and maltreatment of 'colored' by 'white', are still strongly prevalent in U.S.A., long after the formal abolition of slavery. The experience of this race-prejudice, in India, and then more acutely in South Africa, brought the great inspiration of Non-Violent Non-Co-Operation and Civil Disobedience to Mahatma Gandhi, more than forty years ago. That race-prejudice still continues, with perceptible abatement, in India; with not much diminution, in Africa. What common sense requires, what is reasonable and desirable, is that, without any race or caste or birth arrogance, contempt, anger, hate, on any side, there should be an open explanation and understanding, that 'birds of the same feather roost together', that persons with *similar* personal *habits* and *ways of living* may mix together, whatever the race, in all the affairs of life, more freely, than those with dissimilar.

'War has no room for Scruples'.

An English proverb says 'All is fair in love and war'. Lord Kitchener's view, that war has no room for scruples, has been quoted before. The Nazis seem to have carried that maxim, combined with racial arrogance, to a monstrous extreme. They seem to have deliberately fostered this arrogance because of its intoxicating and stimulating effects, as alcohol or other drugs and drinks are served out to troops engaged in actual fighting. Translated extracts, from German writings, like those of Banse, Frick, Gauch, and official utterances, as of Hitler, Goebbels, etc., (Joad, *Liberty Today*, pp. 55, 116; 117, 144, 192-195; Lorimer, *What Hitler Wants*), out-Herod Herod. They go far beyond the worst of British jingoism in brutal coarseness, and extreme assertion of racial superiority.

Keeping pure the 'race', in the sense of 'breed'; and not only *keeping* it such, but *improving* it steadily, by ever better, purer, more purposeful married mating, in accordance with, not only physiological, but also, and even more, psychological eugenics—this is a fine, nay, an indispensable, ideal, for genuine human progress. But when the ideal is perverted into the myth of an immemorially, eternally, 'pure race', 'chosen', and kept 'apart' from all others, from the very beginning of time; and, further, when the myth is perverted into a fanatical 'religion' and a racial arrogance which seeks to oppress and suppress all others—then it becomes a great danger, a demoniac driving-force, a more maddening 'preparation for war' than alcohol and heroin, *bhang* and *hashish*. But present-day Germany is not a solitary instance of such perversion. Many nations, (perhaps all, in the turbulent time of their youth and growth), races, sub-races, classes, castes, denominational sects, have been and are obsessed with such bigoted self-righteousness, self-complacency, self-conceit. The present war is due to such rival bigotries of self-assertive 'Kultur-s' and Imperialisms. The British poet-novelist Kipling, whom William Stead called the 'banjo-bard' of Imperialism, (who has to his credit some very fine work too, of perennial and universal interest, which will ensure him lasting fame), in a moment of nationalist and racialist weakness, invented the phrase "the white man's burden." The implication of it, as usually understood, is that 'the white man' is bearing the burden of keeping the weaker 'colored races' in order and of 'civilising' them, somewhat as if the burden was a heavy Cross. The world knows the nature of the burden; and Germany is endeavouring frantically to take it over, or at least to share it. Western scientists have shown (*vide*, e. g., *We Europeans*, by Julian S. Huxley, A. C. Haddon, and A. M. Carr-Saunders, pub: 1939), that nothing like 'a pure race' to be found today, and that there is no distinctive feature which is confined strictly to any one group of human beings usually called a race or sub-race. Even such a fire-eater as Mussolini has recognised that "race is not a reality; it is only a feeling". But the infecting and the energising of the German nation, with the 'feeling' of belonging to a superlative and 'pure race', serves Hitler's purpose of 'intoxicating' them for war. He therefore utilises it, as rulers of other nations have done before him. And, like the shrewd 'leaders' and 'rulers' of other nations, Hitler is also shrewd enough to combine very 'practical' motives with exhortations to

high 'idealism'; to supplement the promise of heaven with that of a fine earth also. When the appeal to the nobler nature, for the dedication of life to patriotic causes and the glorification of the Fatherland, is "brought to a strategic point by the Hitlerian pledge, 'I promise to give every German man a job, and every German woman a husband', then its effect upon a young generation looking wistfully for guidance and purpose in the apparently pointless and incomprehensive post-war world (i.e., after the previous Great War) may well prove irresistible."¹

India too has long experience of 'high-caste' arrogance, and, latterly, of British racial arrogance, and, within the last three decades, of the Amritsar Massacre, of many scores of minor firings upon crowds thought unruly by the executive, and of all sorts of political repression; though, there is reason to believe, repressive measures by dictator-governments, or even by republican and monarchical governments, like the French, U. S. A., Belgian, Dutch, in the case of 'colored' and 'subject' peoples, would, in all probability, in similar circumstances, be much more summary, cruel, indiscriminate, and extensive.

The Real Cause of the war.

The real ultimate cause of the Nazis' cido-mania is "rooted in the European system", as Laski puts it; rooted in the economic and military race for Imperialism, for colonies, for 'markets', for 'slave-labor' or cheap slave-like labor; which race has been most successfully led by Britain; after the finishing of the Spanish-Portuguese enterprise in America, and the subsidence of those two countries into 'inglorious peace' ('inglorious' forsooth!). The cause is the consequent bitter jealousy and hatred of the other European nations (not excepting France) towards Britain; which has focussed itself, and manifests most powerfully, in the German people, because of their great reserves of will-power and will-to-power, of recuperative physical and psychical vitality, of science, of leadership.

Hitler's speech, of 30-1-1941, indicates that if Britain had conceded Hitler's final demand, and returned the colonies, taken away from Germany, the present war, at least, would have been avoided; though, no doubt, another would have come, before long, in the absence of a re-adjustment of the whole Social Structure of the Human World, and the animation and inspiration of it by a truly Religious Spirit of Altruism regulating Egoism.

¹Joad, op. cit., p. 107.

The Colonies.

This matter of the colonies is made clear by the Marquess of Londonderry: "At Nuremberg, in September, 1937, Herr Hitler brought the colonial question to the front, arguing that, without colonies, Germany's living room was too small to guarantee sufficient food for the nation. 'It is an intolerable thought', he said, 'that year after year we should be at the mercy of a good or bad harvest. The Reich's demand to possess colonies is based upon economic necessity, and the attitude of other countries towards the demand is simply incomprehensible. Germany did not steal her former colonies from other powers, and it would be well if this fact was given consideration in a world where so much *moralising* goes on'. The demand for colonies has, by this utterance, been placed in the forefront of German policy; and the majority of her colonies are administered by Great Britain"... "In my opinion, there is only one difference between Germany and Great Britain which might ultimately lead to war...the German demand for the restoration of their former colonial possessions, which, Herr Hitler has declared, will 'from year to year sound ever more loudly'...I am as reluctant as any British citizen to cede a yard of colonial territory... On grounds of prestige, however, I can fully understand and sympathise with the German demands... The British Empire extends over about one quarter of the globe; the third Reich does not possess an inch of territory outside her frontiers...We shall have to come to some kind of arrangement with Germany as the only alternative to her taking, or attempting to take, what she wants by force" .. "I have strongly criticised the manner in which the legitimate aspirations of Germany have been continually frustrated"... "Mr. Chamberlain had a final interview with Herr Hitler, on the following day, (23-9-1938)...In a final private word, the Fuhrer...added...'There is one awkward question, the Colonies, but that is not a matter for war; there will be no mobilisation for that'..."¹ This last remark, we can readily see, was a piece of 'diplomacy', such as is practised frequently by the diplomats of all 'Great Powers', Britain by no means excepted. Perhaps, if asked, Hitler would explain, in the way of diplomats, that what he meant was that he *trusted* that *Britain* would not regard the matter as one to go to war for;

¹*Ourselves and Germany*, pp. 121, 122, 146, 147, 162. See also the letters from Hitler and Goring, on p. 165.

and that he *hoped* that *Britain* would not compel Germany to mobilise on that account, but would restore the colonies to Germany of her own good and free will, even as she had met Germany's other 'revisionist' wishes, in the course of the 'appeasement' policy. If Hitler meant thus, he was much mistaken. Mr. K. Zilliacus writes: "Mr. Chamberlain said, on March 24, 1938, that the Government are determined to go to war, for any British Colonial possession anywhere, in any part of the world, ..and for Egypt and Iraq...alone if necessary,...regardless of whether we have any allies, and against any odds."¹

Mr. Zilliacus' book is the most outspoken that the present writer has come across, in presenting 'the other side of the medal', and diagnosing and exhibiting the lamentably short-sighted selfishnesses of British imperialistic policies and diplomacies, 'before' as well as 'between the two wars,' which have made this second war also inevitable. He is particularly frank about Mr. Lloyd George's and Mr. Churchill's 'strong' ways, and Mr. Chamberlain's 'weak' ways, and the speakings and doings of a number of other persons, very much to the fore, today, in Britain. During the progress of the appeasement policy, the papers reported that an attempt was made to give some portions of the colonial possessions of Belgium in Africa, (notorious, in the past, for rubber-extraction horrors), instead of returning Germany's own colonies. This generosity, at another's expense, failed, however. Neither Belgium, nor Germany, was agreeable, it seems. The earlier attempt has been already mentioned, of Sir Samuel Hoare, to effect a quiet

¹K. Zilliacus, *Between Two Wars*, pp. 138, 156, 165. "Mr. Zilliacus was born in Japan, of a Finnish father and American mother; he was educated in Sweden, England, and U. S. A.; he married a Pole; and is a naturalised Englishman; ...he is an international": John Gunther, *Inside Europe*, p. 449. He "joined the Royal Flying Corps during the (previous) War;...was sent to Siberia on special (British) Foreign Office Mission, and served as Intelligence Office there; was British member of the Information Section of the League of Nations Secretariat, from 1920 to 1938; has lived in many countries; speaks eight languages:" cover of *Between Two Wars*, (Penguin Series, 1939). In the book, he says (p. 27): "I have quoted first-hand authorities—official despatches, Cabinet Minutes, the *ipsissima verba* of th

partition of Abyssinia between Italy and Britain, which, on exposure, aroused a storm of protest from the better mind of Britain itself.¹ Such diplomacies are, obviously, not favorable to World Peace. They only minister to the megalomania of those mighty knights-errants who think, "the world's mine oyster, which I with sword shall open"; who look upon world-politics and wars as interesting games of chess. Why cannot these great men of all countries, indulge their tastes at the expense of their own strong skulls and bones, instead of the very weak ones of their peoples? The medieval knights were much more reasonable and chivalrous in this respect.

To close the discussion of the colonies: On 25. 8. 1939, in conversation with Sir N. Henderson, Hitler "put forward his *colonial demand*, and, in return, *guaranteed* a reasonable limitation of armaments; Sir N. Henderson said the offer would not be considered *unless* the Polish question was settled." Again, on 28. 8. 1939, "Herr Hitler asked (Sir N. Henderson) whether England would be willing to accept an alliance with Germany...Replying to the suggestion that Britain might offer something immediately in the way of *colonies*, Sir N. Henderson replied that the concessions were easier of realisation *in good rather than bad atmosphere*."² The extracts from Lord Londonderry's book prove amply that there was "good atmosphere," for many years, *before* this interview; but the subject was deliberately shirked all along; and Hitler was driven to desperation. In his speech of 30. 1. 1941, Hitler has again said: "My foreign policy can be summarised in one sentence—*the abolition of Versailles*. My innumerable speeches and memoranda were animated

¹"Over Italy and Abyssinia, the Government's policy, from start to finish, was to do a deal with Mussolini on the lines laid down in the Maffey Report—i.e., giving him the lowlands outright, with some form of compensation for Great Britain in the rest, in return for Mussolini joining an Anglo-French alliance against Germany": *Between Two Wars*, 137.

²*National Herald* (Lucknow), of 23. 9. 1939, (London cablegram of 22. 9. 1939); also *The Government Blue Book*, (Penguin series, Dec. 1939), pp. 146-183. This conversation has been already referred to, pp. 27 and 32, *supra*. Some slight inaccuracies have crept into the wording there, though without impairing the sense. The quotation, on this page, gives the exact words.

by a single idea—to achieve a peaceful *revision* of the Treaty...I never had a single point of dispute with Britain, and offered her my hand again and again. The only difference was that on the colonies, and this was not an urgent problem. The colonies were useless to Britain. Yet she clung to them with the avarice of an old usurer." The meaning of the words, 'not an urgent problem,' is not quite clear; the succeeding context seems to show that Hitler meant, 'not a matter of urgent importance for Britain'.

It is for the sake of these wretched colonies, then; for colonies, in the distance, ultimately; for 'revision' of the shortsighted and nefarious treaty of Versailles, in 1919, for which Mr. Lloyd George, (the Biggest One of the 'Big Ten', and then the 'Big Four', national plenipotentiaries who worked at it), is apparently most responsible, and the late M. Clemenceau (not a 'diplomat' like Mr. Lloyd George, but only a fighter) in the next degree; and for restoration of *status quo* in regard to boundaries, nearer home; for colonies which, if put to auction, would surely not fetch the amount of even a month's expenditure on this awful war;—it is for this that the world has been plunged into fearful turmoil again; that country after country in Europe—Austria, Czecho-slovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg, France, Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria (on 1-3-1941), have been sacrificed; have either been amalgamated with Germany, or have submitted to Hitler quietly, or been subjugated forcibly; some of these have been broken utterly, and are being bombed by Britain also because enemy-occupied; Finland has been flung into war with Russia; Albania conquered by Germany's ally Italy; Greece invaded by Italy, and now threatened by Germany also with active invasion; and Yugo-slavia being intimidated, in the first week of March, 1941; and Iceland has been occupied by a British force¹.

¹This is the state of affairs in Europe. In Asia, Japan is transferring her attentions, in considerable part, from China to Indo-China; and, on 7-3-1941, the Vichy government of unoccupied France, is reported to have accepted the terms of an armistice between France and Thailand (Siam) which Japan has 'proposed' as regards Indo-China; Japan being actively helped in this by Germany. U.S.A. and Australia are helping to strengthen Britain's defences, with sea and land forces in the regions of the Pacific. If Germany subjugates Greece also, and Russia

Alaska was sold by Russia to U. S. A., and Kashmir by Britain to Maharaja, Gulab Singh, at far cheaper rates than these colonies are costing.

Hitler says : "the colonies are useless for Britain". On the other hand, Mr. Curry says : "One frequently reads articles in which it is demonstrated that it is foolish for Germany to want her colonies back, on the ground that she greatly exaggerates the advantage to be obtained from having them." And he goes on to observe very cogently : "Hardly ever does any writer draw the conclusion that, if it is not an advantage to Germany to possess them, it can equally be of no advantage to us to retain them. If, therefore, it is true that the advantages of colonies are greatly exaggerated, it follows that we ought *not* to resist proposals for some other method of governing them. If, on the other hand, the possession of colonies constitutes a real and substantial advantage", (whether pecuniary or political, and strategic), "to the owning power, it follows that their present distribution is a *grave injustice*, bound to threaten the peace of the world, so long as it exists." Therefore, Mr. Curry comes to the right and just conclusion that "the system of mandates, set up by the

remains 'neutral' as at present, and Turkey is unable to offer effective resistance to Germany; then Britain may have to fight against Germany in Iraq and surroundings, with all her might, to prevent Germany's rushing further east. Thus is the Armageddon spreading, and threatening to spread, ever further. Why? Because Messrs. Lloyd George and Clemenceau befooled that noble-hearted and truly wise and far-sighted idealist, President Wilson, who died of a broken heart, disowned by his own capitalist-ridden people also; made a tool of his pet child, the League of Nations, to issue 'mandates' according to their 'mandate'; because they and their successors in office have spread the miasmatic atmosphere of distrust, opportunism, and 'safety first', throughout the world; sterilised and syncopated the League of Nations; dashed to the ground, the risen hope of Mankind, for the realisation of the angelic dream of the Federation of the World and the Parliament of Man; and invoked, instead, this world-devouring fiend of the New World War. Even Mr. Churchill—who has undoubtedly strong streaks of chivalry in him, whatever else he may have or not have—protested against the terms of the infamous Treaty of Versailles—so Mr. Churchill has said in public print.

League of Nations, *implied* a recognition, on the part of the Powers, that *no country* is justified in exploiting colonial possessions in its own purely national interest"; that... "returning the colonies to Hitler would have done nothing to challenge the principle of private colonial possessions," (would indeed have further affirmed it); that .. "what is wrong is, not that we have the colonies instead of Germany; *what is wrong is that any body has colonies*. All that any nation has the right to claim, is the same access as any other nation, to the markets and raw materials of the countries that are now colonial possessions. The *problem of colonies is crucial* in the discussion of our present subject, namely, how to set about creating world government."... "World order, sooner or later, is inevitable. It may come after a period of destruction and chaos... It may come earlier because mankind suddenly acquires sense."¹

'Emergency Socialism'.

How the Over-Mind of Humanity is working in the direction of such a World Order, is illustrated in a remarkable manner, by the following extracts.

In that same speech, of 30-1-1941, "Hitler went on to assert that British Labor leaders were now plagiarising the *social ideas* of Nazism. If the war lasts long enough, this will have disastrous effects for Britain. They will have to send a mission over to us, to take over our Social programme."

By a very curious coincidence, the *Statesman* (Calcutta), 30-1-1941, (which must have been printed off, *before* getting the cabled report of Hitler's speech), has an editorial headed "Emergency Socialism." It begins with the statement, natural in the circumstances, that "Hitler and his creed and practice are essentially evil." Then, after some expansion of this remark, it goes on, "*Nonetheless*, not all the changes which Germany has experienced during the last decade have been bad. Germans are human... Central Europe is not completely inhabited by fools or devils. No revolutionary process, so blackly bad as to be without some glints of good, could have acquired Nazism's indisputable ascendancy over the minds of tens of millions. The underlying constructive element in the German Revolution... may be aptly illustrated by contemporary developments in Britain. There, under a Government

¹W. B. Curry, *The Case for Federal Union*, 112, 113, 119.

containing Labor members, and more Leftward in trend than any...since 1931, *drastic social and economic changes proceed under war's hard stimulus. Class distinctions and consciousness, and the privileges of wealth are being broken down. Heavier taxation, and the sense of fundamental human equalities stirred by physical danger, are the factors in this. Simultaneously, a planned national economy is in process of evolution. Traditional laissez faire principles in finance and commerce are being abandoned; and there seems no likelihood of their full restoration after establishment of peace*". (Unfortunately, that is the weak point, of doubt, and of danger, that when the 'emergency' has passed, the 'socialism' may pass away too; the use of the adjective 'full', by the leader-writer, indicates it; he expects, perhaps wishes and hopes, for a *partial* one; but that will be leaving the prolific germs of the disease un-eradicated; therefore, 'strike while the iron is hot'; 'do not leave the fire smouldering beneath the ashes, to blaze up anew'; 'do not content yourself with planning only a *national* economy, for Britain alone, but, in consultation with the leading minds of other nations, initiate the New World Order now, and firmly.'

The editorial then goes on to describe briefly, some of the changes initiated, and then says: "Now much of all this, disconcerting though some minds may at first find it, *bears unmistakable resemblance to modern economic and social trends in Germany. In different circumstances and for different reasons, the two great European Powers, now so grimly fighting one another, have undergone some analogous internal changes. In both countries; something describable as EMERGENCY SOCIALISM has developed. ...Nor have they been alone in experiencing this.* In so far as the innovation means greater social justice and economic efficiency, it may be welcomed. Having independently arisen, during a brief period, within a *variety of countries*, it evidently constitutes a natural reflection of the scientific age's innate spirit". Then after further interspersions of further abuse of Hitler, which is easily intelligible in the circumstances, the editorial concludes: "It is important that there should be no confusion of thought. *Our enemy is not Socialism, the classless State, and a co-operative, as contrasted with a competitive, economy, but the trampling mendacious domestic and external aggressiveness exemplified in Mein Kampf and the Nazi leader's policies.*"

The leader-writer confesses that all this desirable change towards Socialism in England would not have occurred except for the war, (as it could not have, except for the previous World War, in Russia); and yet he must abuse Hitler for being the cause of the war; for which, many thoughtful, impartial, judicial-minded British writers hold British policies to be at least as much, if not more, to blame. No doubt, Hitler has lied atrociously, repeatedly, to British statesmen. Are these themselves blameless? If the rulers of Britain were sincerely of the opinion that "Our enemy is not Socialism", then, indeed, there would be no war at all, and Hitler would not dare to dream of German ascendancy and world-domination.

We have seen above, the views of Lord Londonderry. He was in the British Ministry till 1935, made many visits to Germany, and gained intimacy with her rulers. He has had exceptional opportunities of knowing, at first hand, the inner workings of the governments of both Britain and Germany. On the subject of the Socialistic changes effected in Germany, he quotes with great approval, from "one of the new Ambassador's first public speeches in Berlin". The Ambassador was the same Sir Nevile Henderson, quoted from before, who was appointed such, in 1937. "... 'In England', he said, 'too many people take an erroneous conception of what the Nationalist-Socialist regime stands for. Otherwise, they would lay *less stress* on *Nazi dictatorship*, and much *more emphasis* on the *great social experiment* which is being tried out in this country. It is regrettable to see how much concentration is applied to save (?) trees which appear misshapen in English eyes, and how little appreciation there is of the great forest as a whole.'..."¹

Lord Londonderry and other British and American Writers on the Case for and against Germany.

In his last chapter, Lord Londonderry explains and extenuates largely, even the Nazis' treatment of the Jews, and other oppressions that are charged against them. That, for some time after his accession to power, in 1933, Hitler carried on his policies secretly as much as possible, and had, on occasions, to resort to 'diplomacy,' was unavoidable for him, in the then circumstances of Germany, if he was to re-vive, re-hearten, re-inspire, re-strengthen, re-arm the crushed and

¹Op. cit. p. 117.

broken German people. That he was able to do so at all, was due to the jealousies between Britain and France¹; and to the fear and hate of Russian Bolshevism entertained by both. Indeed some writers say that there was not much secrecy at all about the business. Some even say that Hitler was actually helped by Britain and France to re-arm. "The (British) Government and the City encouraged and helped Nazi Germany to re-arm, because they wanted the Nazis as a bulwark against Bolshevism in Europe."² Another writer³ says the same thing, but with a difference of wording, which shifts the heavier part of the blame to other shoulders: "The relations between two countries reflect their economic and strategic needs, their comparative strength, their internal politics, their ties with other nations. All these factors are variable; so also are the relations....As long as England and France allowed Germany to win victories in Spain, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hitler played up the Bolshevik menace in order to keep the Western Powers and Russia apart. He did not want England, France, and Russia to join forces, because such a bloc could have checked German expansion. When he could squeeze no further concessions from Britain and France, when instead they began to obstruct him, he turned to Russia. The Soviet Government had, for years, sought to win England and France for an anti-Nazi policy; it had always dreaded a combination of England, France, and Germany...against Russia. But in 1939, the mounting antagonism between two western Powers and Germany ruled out such a combination. Russia's fear of Germany vanished; friendship could come in."

In the last and fifth chapter of his book, however, the author, Mr. Louis Fischer, expresses his views more strongly and freely, in the course of a criticism of a book, *Must the War Spread*, by D. N. Pritt, K.C., M.P. "Mr. Pritt's idea is

¹See Mme. Tabouis' *Blackmail, or War*; also Hugh Dalton's *Hitler's War*.

²*Between Two Wars*, p. 137.

³Louis Fischer, *Stalin and Hitler*, (Penguins; May, 1940), pp. 1-2. The fly-leaf says that the author is an American; went to Russia in 1922, at the age of twenty-six; married a Latvian girl; lived in Moscow for fourteen years and studied Soviet policy; in 1936, went to Spain to study the Civil War; and has written many books on current politics and history.

that the British and French governments deliberately intend that the present European war be 'spread or switched to the U. S. S. R.'; 'switched' means that the Allies will stop fighting Germany and agree with Hitler or his successors to attack Russia together. Incidentally, this shows the opinion which a British 'K. C. and M. P.' holds of the 'statesman-like genius, uprightness, straight-forwardness' of the Allies' 'governments'; and explains why Britain failed to win the trust of Russia and to make an alliance with her. World politics is all a matter, so far, of cunning *against* cunning, ferocity *against* ferocity, for the grinding of mankind; not of benevolent wisdom *with* benevolent wisdom, scientific strength *with* scientific strength, for the comforting of mankind. Mr. L. Fischer strongly contradicts Mr. Pritt: "I can see no evidence of any important tendency in England or France to make peace with Hitler... A peace with Hitler now would be the doom of the West... My (Mr. L. Fischer's) own attitude towards the war is this: Allied spokesmen aver that they went to war for a principle; they are out to crush Hitlerism." (So Hitler avers that he is out to crush British Imperialism). "They were defending liberty against its oppressors, Eden stated. This represents a welcome though very belated avowal of hostility towards a regime which, from its very inception, persecuted churches, dissident political groups, and national minorities, and quickly exterminated every vestige of German democracy... Long after the Nazi tyranny had shown its bloodiest colors, British politicians and aristocrats continued to maintain cordial personal relations with Hitler and his aides... During all the years of appeasement, *the present Allies helped every tyrannical aggressor* achieve his goal, and helped *not a single victim* of aggression. This is recorded history. If the British had wished to defend democracy they might have done so, long ago, when Hitler was weak... Instead, they *nursed Hitler* to greatness, and now they must pay the penalty".

He ridicules the attempt of British and French statesmen "to excuse their supine submission to the Fascist aggressors on the ground that they were militarily unprepared", and adduces facts against the validity of the excuse. "If the Allies had been actuated by a love of democracy and the desire to save weak states from submergence, they would have behaved very differently from the way they did during the *eight years* of appeasement... Much too late, they understood that they themselves were menaced... When they realised

that,...they discovered a most active interest in democracy and freedom ; they suddenly saw Hitlerism in its true light... They did not go to war to fight Hitlerism, but to crush a Germany which aimed at European domination at the expense of the British and French *Empires*. *This is the primary Allied war aim.* But when Germany is a Fascist country, and aggressive because it is Fascist, the defeat of Germany is *ipso facto*, a defeat for Fascism, whether or not Chamberlain and Daladier intended it as such. The force of complicated circumstances had driven British and French reactionaries into a struggle which is anti-Fascist." By this last sentence, the author indicates that the struggle, being anti-Fascist in eventual outcome, is anti-capitalist-imperialist also ; since Fascism is only slightly varied Capitalism and Imperialism, and is therefore against the real wishes at the heart of the capitalist and ruling class.

Argument comes round, full circle.

This brings the argument round, full circle, to the support of the implications of the quotations made earlier from Hitler's speech and the *Statesman's* editorial, both d/ 30. 1. 1941.

What Mr. L. Fischer describes as "the force of complicated circumstances," has been described by others in other words, all meaning the same thing. Napoleon said : "La politique, c'est la fatalité" (Politics—it is fatality, fate, destiny). The poet says : "God fulfils himself in many ways". Proverbial wisdom says : 'Man proposes, God disposes'. The sufferer often feels like saying, 'not always God, but often Satan'. But—God, or God's Nature, Satan, Matter, or the Mystery, is always turning good to ill, and ill to good again. Satan too is made to serve a purpose. When human beings will not learn from pleasure, they must be taught to learn from pain. The imperialist-capitalist rulers of Germany and Britain are both being led, now, by the Mystery, through this horrid War, on the way to over-reach themselves, and play into the hands of a more just and rational New World Order and an all-synthesising truly Spiritual World Religion.

The following further passage, from Mr. Fischer's book, probably every thoughtful and impartial reader, not biassed and pre-judiced by nationalist and territorial patriotism, will agree in ; barring some words here and there. "The British and French Empires were built on plunder and oppression. In the course of centuries, however, Great Britain and France have become the treasure-houses of certain cultural values

and certain political principles. These principles are not perfect. Democracy is far from perfect." (The author presumably means, 'even in Britain, because it is very far yet from having freed itself from all the fetters imposed upon it by plutocracy and timocracy'). "But it is infinitely better than any dictatorship I know. The world is not divided into white and black. There is no white, unfortunately there is a lot of black". (The author, presumably, means, 'there is nowhere any *pure* white or *pure* black; there are only degrees, from light grey to very dark grey; the dictators *have* some good work, for their own peoples, to their *credit* also, if they have much to their *debit*; and so have the 'imperialist-democrats'—contradiction in terms!—both *credit*, for much, not wholly, good work for their own people, and *debit*, for bad work, towards their 'subject'-peoples largely, and partly towards their own people too). "If you insist on white, and will support no other, you can sit in your ivory tower until doomsday, waiting for it to arrive. The choice is between democratic grey and totalitarian black. The greatest peace aim is to banish the black and simultaneously make the grey whiter. The true democrat will fight on the *foreign front* against Fascism, and on the *domestic front* and in the Dominions and INDIA against reaction".¹ This is just

¹ All these quotations are from chap. V of Mr. L. Fischer's *Stalin and Hitler*.

The *Hindustan Times*, 5-3-1941, publishes a very remarkable item of news: "Mr George Gibson, Chairman of the Trades Union Congress, said emphatically, at a luncheon attended by Dominions and Indian Press representatives, that *unless Britain solved the Indian Problem, her Empire would break up*. It was up to Britain to help India find the right solution, and not sit back saying: 'Unless you agree, we cannot do anything'...Mr. Gibson was received by King George". It is to be hoped that Mr. Gibson expressed this opinion to the King also; and that Mr. L. S. Amery, the Secretary of State for India and Burma, has been duly apprised of it too. The same paper publishes another equally remarkable item, from the U. S. A. "Only a handful of voters supported the Nazi World Order, in the latest Gallup poll, concerning maintenance of World Peace after the War. One third of the voting population—20 million people—voted; eight million—the largest group—favoring

what India wants ; even the Congress, at heart ; viz., genuine Dominion Status, with right to make her own Constitution,

some kind of International Federation," (i. e., World Federation). Such a Federation, a World Commonwealth, *including* India, also China, Japan, and other Asiatic countries, is the only final solution.

Dr. G. S. Arundale, President of the Theosophical Society, has been doing yeoman's service to India, by advocating, week by week, genuine Indo-British Commonwealth, in his *Weekly Notes* and *New India Survey*, and through the New India League (Adyar, Madras) which he has started. He has been exhorting Britain to grant Dominion Status to India; in vain. He has been exhorting India, and the Congress in particular, to help Britain's war effort unconditionally; in vain. The Congress wants a declaration of reasonable war-and-peace aims from the British Government—which it will not make, for it is not willing to shed Imperialism. The British Government wants India to be content with elusive, 'diplomatic', ambiguously-worded promises—which India is not prepared to be, for she has been deceived too often, before.

In the *N. I. Survey*, 1. 3. 1941, Dr. Arundale says : — "A certain Robert Sherwood...writes in the London *Sunday Express* of 3. 11. 1940,...'that the strongest, sanest, and most durable guarantee for this New World is a Union of the U. S. A. and the United Kingdom (i. e., Britain), Ireland, Canada, Union of South Africa, Australia, New Zealand.' ...His (Mr. Sherwood's) consciousness is not large enough to envisage India, (which is) obviously, to those who know, the most important unit of the Indo-British Commonwealth of Nations...There will not be much of a guarantee for the New World, if India is left out." When the consciousness of Mr. Amery, who was born in Gorakhpur, in India, is not large enough to envisage India, as equal partner with Britain in a Commonwealth, how can the consciousness be large enough to do so, of Mr. Sherwood, the author of a drama called *Idiot's Delight* ! In *H. Times*, 6. 3. 1941, Mr. Amery is reported to have said, on 4. 3. 1941, also at a London luncheon : "Apart from the threat to vital points in *our Empire in the East*, the gravest danger, a blow at the heart, still confronts us nearer home...Wherever we look, the situation is difficult and dangerous. There is no room for

and to secede if she feels compelled by any circumstances, (which circumstances and compulsion, the vast majority of Indians hope fervently, would never arise—so there is reason to believe). Though Mahatma Gandhi felt himself compelled, by the intransigence of the British Government, to commit himself also to the demand for complete Independence, yet he continues to indicate to the public, from time to time, that what he means is 'the substance of Independence'; which would be full Dominion Status, as was his express demand formerly. His latest public utterance on the subject, d/ 6-3-1941, seems, to the present writer at least, to justify this inference.

Sincere Mutual Explanation of Aims Needed.

All this emphasises over and over again the need for mutual sincere explanation of aims; whence understanding; whence agreement. As Prof: Cramb says: "If Germany is our enemy of enemies,...what is more imperative than that we should *understand* the *spiritual* as well as the material resources of that enemy?...If, on the other hand, Germany is to be England's friend, perhaps even her ally, if blood be indeed thicker than water, then perfect mutual understanding, the *earnest scrutiny* of our separate *aspirations*" (now 'war and peace aims') "can only strengthen that friendship and render that alliance more enduring."¹

But the diplomats *will not* state their war and peace aims, honestly, frankly. Hitler says: 'We must destroy

complacency. But equally, there is no justification for despondency...(We are) far stronger in numbers, far more powerful in resources and equipment, far better trained... than it seemed possible even six months ago". Whence, the natural inference and consequence is that it is not necessary to do justice to India. But, as Madame Blavatsky reported, nearly sixty years ago, as Mrs. Besant repeated, in other words, twenty-three years ago, and as Mr. George Gibbon has said again now, (on 4. 3. 1941, apparently), the World will not have Peace until Justice has been done to India; not have Peace, if India is left to remain the Apple of Discord that she has been, so far, since twenty centuries ago; if she continues to be treated by the rulers of Britain, like Mr. Amery and his predecessors, as a convenient milch-cow, which can be milked at will, though starved.

¹Cramb, op. cit., pp. 3-4.

British Imperialism.' Churchill says: 'We must destroy Hitlerian Imperialism'. The late Lord Lothian was inclined to Socialism and to peace if not pacifism. He said "at the Annual Oration of the London School of Economics, in June, 1931: 'The prophecies of Marx and Lenin are being realised with the most uncomfortable accuracy. When we look round on the Western world as it is, and the persistence of its troubles, is it not obvious that we must probe into the *fundamental causes* far more deeply than we have been in the habit of doing? And, in so doing, I think that we may find that a good deal of the Marxian analysis is true'..."¹, (though Marx's prescription for a new Synthesis is by no means equally true, we may add). Yet he indulged in a course of "prolonged dallying with the Nazis as a 'bulwark against Communism'..."²; and found himself compelled, by the exigencies of his position as British ambassador in U.S.A., to say, at Chicago, on Jan. 4, 1940, that this war is "one more of those tremendous struggles between freedom and tyranny, which have been the central theme of history."² Whose freedom, whose tyranny, what sort of freedom, what sort of tyranny—every listener or reader may interpret for himself, in his own way. Possibly, a German diplomat might use the very same words, meaning very different persons. Another very common "theme of history" has been that belligerents *accuse each other of the very same bad motives*, abuse and vilify each other in the very same terms, and indignantly hurl the very same charges and arguments against each other. Lord Lothian's successor, Lord Halifax, said, at a Press Conference at Washington, on 28-1-1941, that Britain's "main War-aim is victory. Others are to construct the world so as not to have another. Britons would not be fighting so well unless they *thought* they were fighting for Democracy". Germany's war-aim is obviously identical! And the two Titans are in death-grapple—because they have *the same aim*! It must be conceded, though, that Hitler, ordinarily, is brutally frank or frankly brutal, and seldom disguises his ideas with smooth, ambiguous, equivocal, prevaricative, evasive and elusive language, as diplomats do. Some western diplomat, shrewd even during a fit of honesty, has observed that language was given to man (i.e., the politician species of man), not to

¹ Zilliacus, *Between Two Wars*, p. 30.

² L. Fischer, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

disclose, but to hide, his thoughts. Hitler, by Democracy, means National Socialism; as he makes quite plain and unmistakeable; and he explains his ideas of it in *Mein Kampf*, (*vide* abstracts in Lorimer's *What Hitler wants*; also the *Statesman* editorial quoted before). Lord Halifax does not explain what precisely he means by Democracy and how he proposes "to construct the world". So far, Democracy has meant Oligarchy in Britain. Cramb says, in England power has passed "more and more into the ranks of the English race itself, so that you have, for the first time in history, at once a *nation* and a *democracy* that is *imperial*", (pp. 41-42). In practice, an 'imperial democracy' has obviously meant an oligarchy, a plutocracy, in Britain, in France, in U.S.A. In logic, it is a self-contradiction. In consequences, it is difficult to say which is the more oppressive to 'subject'-peoples, a whole nation-ful of 'imperialists', or a single autocratic dictator 'imperialist'. As to "the first time in history", every page of history, every day in the life of every individual, contains events and experiences which occur for "the first time"; and 'history never repeats itself, in the details'. But, if we are willing to see agreements and similarities at least as much as differences and peculiarities, then we may realise that 'history repeats itself, in broad out lines, always', as regularly as sunrise and sunset do, though with variations in the exact times, and in the conditions of clouds, fogs, mists, rains, sky-colors, according to weather and country. It is almost a commonplace with historians, that the British Empire is the Roman Empire reborn; and the Roman Empire had many points in common, especially helots and slaves and serfs, with the Greek 'Empire'; only its dimensions were larger, and the one city of that huge City-State was Rome, while Greece had many city-states. The one City of the huger City-State, the British Empire, is London. Generations of British Statesmen have been brought up in Oxford and Cambridge on the pabulum of Roman history. In theory, the Roman Imperator was only the Chief Executive, the generalissimo and servant of the Roman Senate; in practice, he was its master, with the help of the army, the Pretorian Guards, etc; of whom he was himself the slave in turn. In theory, the King of Britain and 'Emperor of India', is *mon-arch*, auto-crat, without whose "the king wills it" no law can be passed; in practice, his mon-archy has been so 'limited', so 'constitutional'-ised, that

he is truly only the servant of the Legislature; which is, in theory and profession, the servant of the British nation; which, finally, in practice, is shepherded by the clever pushers, hustlers, rustlers, by means of the time-old 'diplomatic policies', converted into 'electioneering and gerrymandering tactics', of (a) 'come into my parlour', 'coaxing, wheedling, flattering, (b) 'graft and boodle'; (c) 'setting rivals by the ears amongst themselves', 'creating dissensions in the enemy-camp', by 'duplicity' and 'hypocrisy', and finally, (d) by 'intimidation', 'violence', of all degrees. These policies and methods have been practised, throughout history, in all times and climes; and are being practised everywhere, today in different settings, aspects, connections. Such is the verity underlying Cramb's self-complacent discovery of "the first time in history".

'Freedoms' in Germany, Britain, India.

The information available (in English) leaves no doubt that suppression of freedom of speech and writing, even of thought so far as possible, (i.e., by hypnosis of the mass-mind by baneful propaganda, through school, press, radio, cinema, all strictly controlled by the State), and, of course freedom of action, has been, at the moment, abolished far more completely by despotic measures in Germany, than in Britain. Yet, from the standpoint of Hitler, all that he has done and is doing has been and is 'war-preparation' and 'war-measures'. He has been turning the whole of the German nation into one army, one vast war-machine. These are the days of 'totalitarian war'. Even in the most democratic countries, no expression of any the least dissent is permitted to the soldiers. Complete obedience in speech, act, and even thought, is demanded. The German plea has been, since before the previous Great War, that their nation had been put into a strait waistcoat by Britain; which was their way of disguising Germany's wish for imperialistic expansion. Britain's imperialism was not prepared to unbutton the strait waistcoat put upon Germany; for fear lest, when Germany's arms were free, she might try to snatch away from Britain a few of the many fine loose-fitting waistcoats, coats, and overcoats that Britain had put on. As the Persian proverb says: '*Ten faqirs can sleep comfortably under one blanket; but two emperors cannot be contained at one and the same time by the whole earth*'. Hence the clash.

It is also evident that, while Hitler has re-acted against British 'democratic imperialism' as above; British rulers, by re-reaction against Hitler's measures, are finding themselves

compelled to take somewhat similar measures, (though by no means to the same extent, as yet), in Britain. Theoretically, by lightning-legislation, by Act passed within less than two hours, at one sitting of the Parliament; all property and all labor have been put at the absolute disposal of the Government. A Sedition Act was passed in 1934, apparently in expectation of, and preparation for, such a war as has come. A paper, the *Daily Worker*, was suppressed after the beginning of 1941. In India, of course they are taking much severer measures than in Britain; some thousands of Mahatma Gandhi's (as well as independent Ahrar and other) Satyāgrahis, 'truth-insisters', 'truth-maintainers', 'conscientious objectors' to imperialist war, have been already put in prisons and detention-camps, and fined heavily, and so on. But be it noted that these 'conscientious objectors' would *not*, (with the exception of Mahatma Gandhi, who objects to *all war* whatsoever, not only offensive, but also defensive), be objectors to the war, if the definitely and reliably avowed aim of it were to replace both Hitlerian would-be imperialism and Britain's actual imperialism, by a Rational World Order, or at least full Dominion Status in India.

The British Labor Party's.

Declaration of Policy.

Hence the persistent cry, in Britain, from the Labour Party, and in India, from the Congress, for a declaration of the British Government's War-and-Peace aims. Incidentally Mr. Churchill, as Prime Minister, with the very 'practical' insight, into the weaker side of human character, of the skilful 'politician', has taken quite a number of important Labor-leaders into the Cabinet, and, thus, weakened that cry of Labor, and indeed 'practically' converted Labor to his views; even as Mr. Ramsay Macdonald was converted by the Liberal Party, by being given the Premiership. It should be noted, however, that Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress have so far failed to 'de-clare' their own aims, the sort of World Order, or at least India-Order, they want, except by the single word Swa-raj, which does not 'clari-fy' matters at all. Indeed they have not even tried to do so, but have been relegating to a future Constituent Assembly, that troublesome, brain-worrying, exacting task. 'Put off till tomorrow whatever you can avoid doing today'! The National Executive of the British Labour Party, however, decided on, and published a

Declaration of Policy, on February 9th, 1940, five months after the commencement of the War. This forms the very important appendix, (pp. 183-191), of *Hitler's War*, by Mr. Hugh Dalton, M. P., now Minister for Economic Warfare in Britain. Every word of this Declaration of Policy is worth careful pondering on. The following are a few sentences from it: "...Victory is our immediate task. *But*—before the peoples are still further estranged by hatred and suffering, a lasting and just *Peace may be brought nearer, by stating clearly now, what our immediate war purpose is, and what should be the principles of the final settlement...* Recalling moreover, the British Government's statement that '*we seek no material advantage for ourselves*', the Labour Party demands that undertakings shall be given to the German People that, in the general arrangement after the war, the *just and real interest of all the Peoples* will be respected, including those of the German People. ...This will assuredly not be the last war in Europe, unless, when this war ends, we can succeed in reconciling French claim to Security with the German claim to Equality....*Six years ago*, the Labour Party defined its purpose, in foreign policy, as 'the building of a Co-operative World-Commonwealth', and declared that 'to have Peace we must subordinate sovereignty to world institutions and obligations'. This is still Labour's Peace aim. The Labour Party, therefore demands that the Peace Statement shall establish a new Association or Commonwealth of States, the collective authority of which must transcend, over a proper sphere, the sovereign rights of sovereign States. ...All nations, great or small, must have the right to live their own lives, free but co-operative, within the framework of a *New World Order*. *Labour will be no party to imperialist exploitations*, whether capitalist or other....All international disputes, wherever arising and of whatever sort, must be settled by peaceful means, through pre-determined procedure of arbitration and conciliation...Successive British Governments, since 1931, have a heavy share of responsibility for its collapse (i. e. of the League of Nations) ..A New World Order...can only be securely founded on Socialism and Democracy. The necessary unity of purpose will be lacking if the *peoples remain divided internally into two nations*, sundered by wide differences of wealth, privilege, and opportunity. Lasting Peace depends on *social justice within States*, no less than on *political justice between*

States.¹ The necessary vigor and power of growth will be lacking if the individual citizen is treated as the slave of the State, or is denied such freedom of opinion, speech, and faith, as is compatible with the freedom of others. These elementary freedoms should constitute a new and *world-wide Declaration of the Rights of Man*.² A very grave economic crisis will confront all nations at the conclusion of the War...In addition to national policies of reconstruction, therefore, there must be bold economic and financial *planning* on a *world-wide* scale...The purpose of such schemes should be to make available greater abundance,...*for all mankind*."

The Only Cure : World Order plus World Religion.

In short, the only cure for the World's Chronic Malady, now threatening to become fatal, is the replacement of Imperialism and Capitalism, throughout the world, by a Rational Scheme of Individuo-Socialism. And that Scheme can be made secure, and sure of efficient working, only if inspired and permeated by a Rational Philosophical and Psychological Religion.

Prof: Cramb describes a British traveller in Germany, who "returns aghast at the intensity of hate which he found... an all but insane desire for war with England, which animates every class of society." Prof: Cramb wrote this in 1913. In the same book he also writes: "Treitschke, (born 1834, died 1896) casting his eyes back to primitive German history, sees arise there the Religion of Valour...We can trace in the Germany of 1913, the vision of that same religion returning to Germany, the Religion of Valour".

Again he quotes the poet-philosopher Nietzsche: "While preparing to found a *World-Empire*, Germany is also preparing to create a *World-Religion*...Ye have heard how, in old times, it was said, Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth; but I say unto you, Blessed are the valiant, for they shall make the earth their throne. Ye have heard men say, Blessed

¹See App. C, *infra*. The ancient Indian Scheme endeavours to do just this, viz. to establish *Social justice* WITHIN *States*, to make such *two nations* within one State impossible; and thereby automatically secures *political justice* BETWEEN *States*. It outlines the best and most Scientific form of Socialism and Democracy. It also provides opportunities for the martial temperament.

²See App. B.

are the poor in Spirit ; but I say unto you, Blessed are the great in soul and the free in spirit, for they shall enter into Valhalla. And ye have heard men say, Blessed are the peace-makers ; but I say unto you, Blessed are the war-makers, for they shall be called, if not the children of Jahve, the children of Odin, who is greater than Jahve."¹

Nietzsche died, in 1900, in a lunatic asylum. Yet there is an element of truth in what he said ; and the meek as well as the valiant, the poor in spirit and the great in soul and free in spirit, the peace-makers and the war-makers, the Religion of 'Peace-ful' Wisdom and the Religion of 'Power'-ful Valour, also the Religion of 'all-Nourishing' Commerce and the Religion of 'all-Helping' Labor—all these four indispensable 'Religions' are reconciled and synthesised in the ancient Indian scheme, by the simple, utterly rational, scientific method, of assigning to each its proper time-place-circumstance. "There is a season for everything."

But Cramb's mind did not work in the way of Indian thought on the subject, though he quotes from Botticher, and, further, puts into the mouth of an imaginary German critic of Britain, some very kind and highly appreciative words about that older thought and about the past achievements of India.² He did not have sufficient leisure from other absorbing studies to get adequate understanding of that thought. Even Indians have forgotten much of the very essence of its significance. Western, and, in their wake, eastern, scholars are now beginning to glimpse more of it, and appreciatively too.

Nor did Prof: Cramb's mind work in the ways of Socialism. He contemplated and welcomed the prospect of war between Germany and England, with medieval ardour. He says: "If these are the legitimate impulses, the just ambitions, of Germany—and what Englishman, remembering the *methods* by which the *British Empire* has been established in India, in America, in Africa, in Egypt, dare arraign those impulses or those ambitions?—if these are the modes which the 'will-to-power' assumes in modern Germany, what of England and those needs of England with which they enter most immediately into collision?" His answer to this question is a quotation "of Rome's mission which Virgil puts into the mouth of Anchises :

¹ Cramb, op. cit., pp. 7, 97, 116-117.

² Ibid. pp. 24-28.

...Others, I know it well, the breathing bronze shall chase,
And from the death-cold marble up call the living face,
Shall plead with eloquence not thine,

shall mete and map the skies,
And with the voice of science tell

when stars shall set and rise ;
Be thine, O Rome, to rule ; nor e'er this destiny forego,
To spare who yield submission, and bring the
haughty low."¹

The Mission of Britain as seen by Cramb.

"To give all men an English mind"—(quoted before),
is the refrain of his book. The whole book is very eloquent,
exhilarating, exciting, exalting, to the 'young' mind ; but
it is by no means sound and wise, in the judgment of the
'old' mind. Prof: Cramb has himself censured "the emotion
of insular narrow conceit enshrined in that most vulgar of
all national hymns, 'Rule Britannia'.

"The nations not so blest as thee
Must in their turn to tyrants fall,
Whilst thou shalt flourish, great and free,
The *dread and envy* of them all."

Consider the world-picture which that upcalls ! A single island
usurping that freedom, surrounded by a world groaning beneath
tyrants, whilst she sits in lonely grandeur !"² Prof: Cramb's
judgment does not seem to be quite sound, either in the decrual
of these, or in the eulogy of the Virgilian, lines. The composer
of 'Rule Britannia', very probably, did not have in his mind
what Cramb imputes to him. His choice of words may not

¹ Op. cit., 121-123. By quoting these lines, as embodying
the ideal of Britain, Cramb implicitly contradicts his observa-
tions about "the first time in history", quoted above. An
English poet has concentrated Virgil's lines,

"Let others dance, sing, sculpt, paint, count, write, prate,
But it is thine to rule the world, O Roman !"

And another has added the savage ending of such
hanteur, in sad commentary,

"And then be trampled down beneath the heel
Of Gaul and Goth, Hun, Lombard, and Teuton !"

Excessive "pride goeth before a fall", say the scriptures,
always. But "the only lesson of history is that men never
learn from history", as Hegel said.:

² Op. cit. 93-94.

be, indeed is not, happy ; but he very probably meant only to emphasise the fact that the British people had, by their own efforts, succeeded in achieving a greater degree of 'freedom' from 'tyranny' than the other nations had ; because these others had not the needed love of freedom and courage to fight for it, and could only look on at Britain with envy, and at their own respective tyrants with dread ; also, the tyrants would look at Britain with some degree of dread in their hearts. This is not altogether incorrect ; and Britain has been the home of political refugees, from other countries, for many generations ; though, latterly, there has been less consideration shown to such ; and, in particular, Indian 'politicals', who had incurred the anger of the British Government, have had to seek refuge in other countries. On the other hand, Cramb overlooks the "insular narrow conceit enshrined" in Virgil's lines, and the greater hauteur needed "to bring the haughty low". In any case, whatever may be the merits or demerits of such expressions of 'nationalist pride', which are common to all nations, not peculiar to the British by any means—and, surely, they all have had their usefulness in the past, even as 'competitive team-spirit', 'esprit de corps', has its good use, for developing courage, will-power, muscle, in the young ; such feelings and expressions are out of date now, in any case, in this Age of Science ; which binds together physically, and therefore should unify in mind and spirit also, all nations ; and would do so, if only it were inspired by recognition of the Universal Spirit pervading all the multi-versal forms of Matter.

The one refrain of the common unifying Human Song, (in contra-distinction from the peculiar separating National Songs), should be, and is indeed becoming—a 'New World Order, inspired by the Eternal World Religion', which is a complete Philosophy and Science and Code of Life ; not such separate refrains for separate nations, as that of Cramb's book, '*Give* all men the English mind' ; or of German books, '*Give* all men the German mind' ; 'give' meaning 'impose forcibly on'. Out of such compulsory 'giving', instead of attractive persuasion and voluntary acceptance, springs War.

Cramb's half-hearted talk of Peace and Internal Organisation.

Cramb is too widely read a scholar, too learned a historian, not to glimpse the danger of disaster to the human world, in modern conditions, that cannot but arise, when British 'Roman'

should encounter German 'Roman', 'Greek meet Greek', 'Tartar confront Tartar', and 'Jingo and Chauvin come face to face with Junker', on such far-flung lines and areas, with such extensivity and intensity, on land, in air, on and in sea. He therefore makes a half-hearted attempt, at the beginning of the very last section of his book, to talk of 'peace'. "With the twentieth century, England has reached a stage in the career of empire, when her policy, whatever it may have been in the past, becomes, definitely a policy of *peace, not war*, of *internal organisation, not of outward expansion*. England's task now, that is to say—if there were no other power than England—is the evolution, not of an exterior uniformity, but of an *inner harmony*, the *organisation* of this empire that we already possess, the founding of an *imperially representative government*. New problems of every kind, arising from within her own bounds are pressing for solution, in INDIA, in Egypt, in Canada, and in the Southern Seas. How is the Central Government of this vast and complex structure of empire ultimately to be organised? Who are to compose the Imperial Parliament? Upon what principle are its members to be elected, from whom, by whom? It seems as if the political genius of the nation or the empire were to be strained to create not only a new school of Statesmen, but almost a *new Statesmanship*...Is it conceivable, if those very principles which have made Britain an empire are to persist—the larger freedom, the higher justice—is it conceivable that those organised countries,...will be content to supply the means of peace and war and yet have no voice whatever in the decision of peace and war? It is absolutely inconceivable...There is that wider and still more intricate problem of INDIA. Freedom, a French thinker once defined, as the power to exercise the will in the pursuit of its *highest ends* without fear. For this alone gives to the mind...tranquillity,...security...It is just this tranquillity, this security, which she (England) cannot find..."¹

¹This was written by Cramb in March, 1913. Instead of "a policy of peace, not war", the Great War was begun in August, 1914, by Britain at least as much as by Germany, as impartial British writers themselves, (among them, an ex-Chancellor, Lord Loreburn), have clearly written. Instead of "internal organisation; not outward expansion", Britain added about a million and a quarter square miles of German colonies;

Knowledge of all kinds) and Reason, man becomes able, more and more, to see and remember the consequences of Love and of Hate; and thereby, to regulate, more and more, his obedience to and indulgence of those primal incentives. Love creates: Hate destroys; Reason helps to balance and preserve. Rationality makes it possible for man to discern between what is more Good and what is more Evil for him; and so to minimise the Love (carnal Lust) which creates, pro-creates, Evil, and the Hate which destroys Good; and to maximise the Love (mental-spiritual Affection) which engenders Good, and the Hate (righteous Wrath) which suppresses Evil. The more is man able to do this, the more is he true man, Superman; not 'the blonde-savage-superman' and rabid tiger of Nietzsche and other fire-eaters of whatever nation or race. The advance of man, in Rational Intelligence, to the stage where he realises the principles of all-synthesising World Order and World Religion and of Universal Peace and Moral Equivalents of War (—as war, primarily and perpetually, against our own lower nature, our baser Egoistic passions and appetites, and, secondarily, against the wilder and harmful living and non-living Forces of Nature); such advance will mean the advent of a much finer Civilisation of true Supermen and Superwomen, in place of the present civilisations of lusting, strutting, snarling, roaring, clawing, pawing, animal-men and animal-women, hunting, rending, mangling, mutilating, murdering each other.

Cramb's Self-contradictions.

Cramb fails to see, or to remember, these simple truths, when writing his book. His vision, despite his scholarship, is too much obscured by patriotic prejudice. He fails to see the glaring self-contradictions into which he falls over and over again. He himself recounts Britain's—he always says England's, ignoring Scotland, Wales, Ireland—failings and fallings from 'traditions of justice and high ideals', and refers to the 'methods' by which she gained 'world-predominance'; and at the same time talks of her 'will-to-peace' (!) and of Germany's 'will-to-power'. He forgets that 'high ideals and ancient traditions of justice' include such simple principles as these: "Do as you would be done by", "Honesty is the best policy", "Frankness is the deepest diplomacy", "Share with others equitably", "Do not try to misappropriate everything", "Let others have their due share of freedom, and do not reserve it all for yourself alone", "Physician, cure thyself", "Think

of the beam in your own eye, and not only of the note in another's", "If you are fighting for freedom, as you profess, do not keep others in bondage, but let them fight side by side *with* you as equal partners, and do not drive them to fight *against* you for their own freedom from you".

It does not enter into Cramb's mind at all, as even a possibility, that 'world-predominance', may be, should be, can be, replaced by 'world-federation' and 'world-equality', ('equality' in a broad 'political' sense, not too strict). He is too much of a 'National-Imperialist' to entertain even the possibility of a 'Nationalist-Socialist', or of any kind of Socialist, much less Communist. In his time, it may be said in excuse for his failure, Socialism had not become such a force as it has since become; but that would be rather a poor excuse, for a professor of history, in the twentieth century, in Europe, who is expected to be widely read, very thoughtful, judicial-minded, able to take broad and deep views of political, social, economic causes and effects, and of the trends of human evolution, and has, for reflecting upon, ample material at hand in the shape of socialist literature. The only real excuse is that we all are, after all, more or less 'creatures' of circumstances, swayed by 'nationalist' and 'racialist' crowd-mentality, crowd-panics, crowd-enthusiasms. Only the very, very, rare 'avaṭāra-s' are 'creators' of circumstances¹.

In view of the very slow, very painful, very to-and-fro, zig-zag, set-back-and-push-forward processes of Evolution, especially of the Evolution of Rational Spirituality and Spiritual Rationality, it was unavoidable that there should be the previous and now the New World War.

We can only pray fervently that Mankind, especially its rulers, may now realise that this War is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the spirit and the Law of *Struggle* for Existence and Imperialism (which Law, Frederick the Great, and very many of his predecessors in rulership, saw in political human history, and Cramb, the professor of history, adhered to; we can only hope that they may be compelled by that realisation to give attention to the Law of *Alliance* for Existence and to the scientific scheme of Individuo-Socialism; the predominance of which Law over the other is, in the present conditions

¹ The present writer has attempted to develop this theme in his book, *Krishna, a Study in the Theory of Avatars*.

of the world, the very condition of human survival, as said by Curry, (quoted before, p. 72, *supra*).

Why is it necessary to reiterate over and over again, the indispensability of Rational Spirituality and Spiritual Rationality i. e. Essential World Religion? Because, as has been noted before, Civilisation and Religion have always risen and fallen together. As has been the quality and nature of the one, such has been of the other; and vice versa; by action and reaction; as that of body and soul; or body and mind, if you prefer the latter word.

Cramb quotes Nietzsche, (p. 116): "Thus while preparing to found a *World-empire*, Germany is also preparing to create a *World-religion*. No cultured European nation since the French Revolution has made any experiment in creative Religion...The fated task which England has declined, Germany will essay."

Unfortunately, the religion which Nietzsche recommends—and Germany has accepted his recommendation—is the 'Religion of Valour,' as said above, without subordinating it to, and governing it by, the Religion of Wisdom, at the same time. Such Wisdom *includes* the Principles of an Equitable Social Order and Structure. No doubt, Hitler has a fresh social structure in mind; we have seen above his brief reference to the British 'plagiarisation,' and the fuller mention in the *Statesman's* Editorial, of the Emergency-Socialism in Britain. But neither in Germany, nor in England, is apparent any Spirituality and any Scientific Psychology at the base of that socialism. Wells, Russell, and the other prominent exponents and advocates of socialism, have no room for any such spirituality. They even expressly flout it. They seem to think it not worth while to distinguish between priestcraft and Spiritual Religion; between the essentials and the non-essentials of Religion. Many of them seem to have made positively sure that the human being has no life at all other than the life of his single present body on this earth. They find it completely satisfying, to utter the words—'Matter,' 'Laws inherent in Matter,' 'Evolution,' 'Mutation' and 'Variation' by 'Chance' or 'Unknown Cause,' etc. Yet the most thoughtful scientists of the day, front-rank leaders in all the sciences, have gone back to Mind, Consciousness, Spirit, as the ultimate beyond and behind and within and governing Matter. And, in any case, the vast Mass of Mankind craves Religion, of some sort, of any sort, and will

cling to the worst sort if it cannot be given and cannot find a better. This is the rock on which all schemes of Socialism or Communism, based on the merely Materialist and Economist Interpretation of History, are bound to split.

Religion implies (1) something to believe in, as infallible guide, in the darknesses of life; to find rest in, as unfailing support, when weary and heavy-laden with misery; to derive strength from, as exhaustless Source of life and power, in dire distress; (2) something to love, nay, to worship and cling to, as perfection of Truth, Beauty, Goodness, and as above and beyond mortality and earthly weaknesses and limitations; also something to hate energetically and actively, as embodiment of Evil; and (3) something to do, some aim to achieve. Such is one way of putting, very briefly, the threefold intellectual, emotional, and volitional constituents of all Religion.¹

Therefore, in the absence of a Rational Spiritual Religion, the German People have taken to the Religion of Valour; have taken Hitler as God²; *Mein Kampf* as infallible Bible; Britain as the Enemy; destruction of British Imperialism and establishment of German Nationalist-Socialism, and World-Dominion, or at least World-Leadership, as the end and aim of their being. *Per contra*, the British People too, in the absence of that same Rational Religion, have taken to the same Religion of Valour combined with the Religion of Money, though they have an organised Church and profess belief (and, no doubt, very many individual Britons do sincerely believe) in God and the Bible; their infallible guide is the Statute Book supplemented and corrected by Orders in Council; their real personal object of worship is the Cabinet; of hate, at present, is Hitlerian Germany; and their *raison d'être* is the maintenance and expansion of Britain's

¹The theme is expounded in the present writer's *The Essential Unity of All Religions*.

²"Hitler has made the gods jealous.. Hitler is lonely; so is God; Hitler is like God": Dr. Franck, quoted by Joad, *Liberty Today*, pp. 55, 195. One wonders what it can be that induces a (presumably) highly educated person like Dr. Franck to perpetrate this astonishing syllogism. Only one thing is clear. Hitler has poured new life into the German People in the seven years of his regime, whatever the ultimate outcome may be of his adventure, and even though he may over-shoot the mark.

'World-predominance'. Of course, there are numbers of worthy individuals in both countries, who are not hypnotised by these notions, though their bodies may be liable to conscription for this utterly Insane War; but they seem to be entirely powerless, at the moment, to do anything else than allow themselves to be carried along by the overwhelming torrents of hatred that are flooding both Germany and Britain.

The English proverbs say—and the proverbs of all countries embody the quintessence of the wisdom gathered out of the experience of thousands of years: 'Tis an ill wind that blows nobody good', and 'The darkest cloud has a silver lining'. There is a gleam of light behind the heavy gloom of black hate that is hanging like a pall of doom over the nations today, or is, indeed, enveloping them, as in a shroud. That gleam is in the rational, impartial, un-biassed, humanitarian minds of those worthy individuals, last mentioned, who are 'truly practical' enough to be able to think in terms of Mankind, instead of 'my nation' and 'your nation', 'my race' and 'your race'; able to envisage a broad 'Universal Peace' as something possible and practicable, instead of the perpetually recurring Wars which are proving more and more 'un-practical'. Through the work of such, (and they may perhaps, some day, see fit to think it not altogether *infra dig.* to bestow a few hours of scrutiny upon the Principles of the Ancient Indian *Scientific* Individuo-Socialism), will emerge that improved, comprehensive, perfected Socialism, ('perfected', so far as possible for human minds to perfect it), which will develop out of the 'Emergency Socialism' of both Germany and Britain, above referred to, and also out of that other form of Nationalist-State-Socialism which, in Russia, has been replacing, more and more completely, the scheme with which Lenin began in 1917. Such may well be the hope of Mankind, for the emergence of Sanity out of the Insanity that is raging at present.

The 'Ideal' of Universal Peace, vs. the 'Practical-Real' of Perpetual War.

It may be briefly mentioned here that, though Cramb shows, in his book, no awareness of the possibility of a Socialist Organisation of the Human Race, or even of the existence, in Britain itself, of any school of thought on the subject, and much less of the feasibility of any Scheme of such Organisation; still he is not unaware of the existence of that band of thinkers which advocates "Universal Peace"

(pp. 40, 52, etc.). Indeed, in a whole chapter, (ii, 'Peace and War', pp. 41-66), he rapidly and eloquently surveys the history of the rival schools, one of "Pacifism" (pp. 43, 47, *et seq.*), the other of Militarism, from Greek times downwards. He recognises also that "the theory of Pacifism is a growing force in English thought and English literature" (p. 43). But he characterises it all as "effusive sentiment" (p. 44), "loathsome sentiment" (45), "extravagances of Tolstoi" (48); and he concludes in favor of War, on the basis of an astonishing interpretation and application of a famous sentence of the Bible! (pp. 56-57) "...In human life as a whole, there are always elements and forces, motives and ideals, which defy the analysis of reason—mysterious and dark forces. '*Man shall not live by bread alone*'! In war this element constantly tends to assert itself. It assumes forms that sometimes are dazzling in their *beauty*; sometimes are wrapt in a *transcendental wonder*; sometimes, in appearance at least, are simply utilitarian, or chimerical, or fantastic. But all alike have the quality of defying reason...It is easy to demonstrate that the *glory* of battle is an *illusion*; but by the same argument you can demonstrate that *all glory*, and *life itself*, is an *illusion* and a *mockery*. Nevertheless, men still live and go on pursuing that illusion and that mockery." Therefore—War as such is *desirable*; not even merely a very disagreeable necessity; not even merely Defensive War, but also Offensive aggressive imperialist War! So Cramb forestals Mussolini in the hymning of War as War.

But—"God will not be mocked." 'Men live not by *Material* bread alone; they *live* much more by the *Spiritual* Bread of *Mutual Affection* and *Rational Co-operation*.' They *die*, physically as well as spiritually, by sadistic war; though by truly defensive war against savage invaders they, as well as their dependents, *may live* physically also, and surely do so spiritually. 'They who slay, by the unrighteous, unjust, rapacious, marauding sword, shall be surely slain by a similar, or by a righteous, sword.' "Vengeance is Mine"; i.e., it comes from within, from the depths of the Universal Self, 'I', 'Me', which pervades victim and victimiser, and compels the latter, from within as well as from without, to make reparation and undergo penalty and penance, harsh in degree corresponding to the cruelty of the wrongs inflicted. "Sins come home to roost unfailingly," soon or late; soon, if they are dire; late, if mild. 'The immediate causes of the previous and the current

World Wars are proof. Even President Wilson, well-intentioned idealist though he was, suffered grievously from race-prejudice, and insulted the Japanese nation as a whole, at the Versailles Peace Conference, by insisting that 'yellow men' could not be treated in the same way as 'white men'; and he did this, after the 'yellow men' had fully justified their claims to equality with the 'white men', in accord with the only standard sincerely acknowledged by the latter, viz., martial prowess, by beating 'the white men' in the person of Russia—then held in 'respect', if not 'terror', by all the other nations of 'white men.' It may well be inferred that this serious flaw of race-prejudice in the idealist-armor of Pt. Wilson, enabled Messrs. Lloyd George and Clemenceau to get at his other weak points; to induce him to give up thirteen of his 'fourteen points,' one by one; and to so manipulate and manœuvre matters that Britain and France were able ultimately to monopolise and puppetise his 'fourteenth' and last point, the League of Nations, by means of which he fondly hoped to be able to win back the purposes of the other thirteen. The consequence of this 'dire sin' was the implanting of undying hate in the mind of the 'yellow man' against the 'white man' generally, and the U. S. A. particularly; the disgusting and the demoralising of all the other nations; the many smaller 'rapes' of weaker by stronger nations; and now the outbreak, within twenty years, of this second vast Conflagration, which threatens to engulf all the human world.

Cramb's Grievous Error; its Cause.

The cause of Prof. Cramb's grievous error seems to be this. A half-truth is more dangerous than a whole error. It may be said that most errors are half-truths; but what is meant here is that a partial, distorted, confused glimpse and grasp of any of the more important and wide-reaching truths, is more baneful in consequence than even a bad mistake, a 'whole error', in respect of a comparatively less important matter. Cramb's view of war obliterates the ineradicable distinction between Good and Evil. That a course which is 'good' in one set of circumstances, may *become* 'evil' in another, that a 'good' custom may become corrupt and corruptive by change of conditions, especially by excess—such facts do not obliterate the distinction; rather, they emphasise it. In any given time, place, circumstance, a 'good' will always be opposed to an 'evil'—though both must ever be only comparative. Every virtue has its vice; every vice has its virtue; every shine has its shadow; every shadow has its shine; but, therefore,

virtue and vice, shade and shadow, are not identical; 'has' does not mean 'is'. What is 'good' now, may *become* 'evil', at some other time, in other conditions; and *vice versa*; what is 'black' now, may *become*, i. e., appear, 'white', and *vice versa*, if the constitution of the human eye is changed; but black *is* not white, and white *is* not black; good *is* not evil, and evil *is* not good. Of course, there is no *absolute* good, nor *absolute* evil. The two are patently relative, comparative. In the Absolute, there is neither Good nor Evil; or, which means the same thing, there are *both* Good *and* Evil, in absolute balance and mutual nullification and negation.

Defensive War is 'good', has its genuine true 'glory,' 'dazzling beauty,' 'transcendental wonder'; 'Offensive War' is 'evil', and if it has any glory, etc., then these are false, are tinsel imitations, are mere glamour; even as deceit, fraud, and hypocrisy are that imitation of virtue which constitutes the homage that Falsehood pays to Truth. Imitation is the sincerest flattery. Cramb fails grievously to distinguish between defensive and offensive war.

If we begin tracing back the 'legality' of any particular piece of private property to its origin, that origin will almost always be found to be some act of more or less forcible appropriation. Therefore common law does not endeavour to go back to such ultimate origins; it makes an arbitrary beginning at a given point of time, and assumes that conditions at that time were 'right'. On the larger scale, the same process takes place in the case of the birth of new States; e.g., we have to begin with 1776, for the U. S. A., and with other years for the other states of North and South America; or with 1917, for Russia. All the awful horrors of the murdering and extermination of the previous owners of the soil, the Amer-indians, and the Russian *dvoryanin*, the nobility, etc., must be put out of mind. But having made a beginning with a 'clear' (!) slate, at an arbitrarily fixed point of time, the law which makes the indefeasible distinctions of right and wrong, good and evil, crime and honesty, defensive and offensive, just and unjust, virtuous and vicious, at once becomes applicable and inevitably comes into force.

Similarity of Cramb's Error with Freud's.

The error and confusion which Cramb fell into, is of the same sort into which very many of us have been falling in the past; and continue to fall. A very recent and outstanding example is Freud. Freud built 'the new Science of

psycho-analysis' 'the new psychology', also on the basis of the "mysterious and dark forces" of the 'Unconscious'. But, very late in life, he discovered the very imperfect and insecure half-truth quality of his basis; regretted the lack, in Europe, of a satisfactory theory of these dark forces, the human instincts; confessed his own ignorance of the real nature and number of them, and his neglect of metaphysic; recorded a half-hearted partial admission of his mistake in regarding Religion as an Illusion; and made unsatisfactory attempts to correct and improve upon his earlier conclusions.¹ It was too late. But undoubtedly he did very important and useful pioneer work. His, and even more, his followers', exaggerations and omissions will have to be, are being, corrected by subsequent workers. Then the really good and valuable features of his work will shine out the better, in their more balanced and appropriate form and useful application, freed from the deleterious coatings which now overlie them. Even so, Defensive War has to be separated from Offensive War. Obviously, in every War, one side will be on the Defensive, the other on the Offensive. Who is on which side—is matter for decision by the 'Rational Third Person'; as in ordinary lawsuits; here, by the Rational Federal World Authority, which is to come when mankind has, by a large majority, found Wisdom.

Much the same is the case of the views of the eulogists of war, like Cramb. They confuse, mix up, defensive war which is 'good', and offensive aggressive war which is 'evil'. Because Duality is inseparable from God's Nature, egoistic offensive evil war is inevitable; and therefore altruistic

¹See Freud's latest books, *The Future of an Illusion* (1929); *Civilisation and Its Discontents* (1930); *Autobiography* (1936). For an exposition of the ancient Indian theory of the primary and secondary, egoistic and altruistic, virtuous and vicious, physical and psychical, worldly and unworldly, Material and Spiritual, Pursuant and Renunciant, Instincts, Appetites, Urges; *bubhukshā*, *bhoga-ichchhā*, Will-to-enjoy (-the-things-of-sense), and *mumukshā*, *moksha-ichchhā*, Will-to-freedom (-from-the-bonds-of-materiality), and the many divisions and varieties of these; the reader, if he cares to pursue the subject, may consult the present writer's *The Science of the Emotions*, *The Science of the Self*, and *The Essential Unity of All Religions*, with the help of the Indices.

defensive good war against it, is, ordinarily, the necessary duty of those who have arrived at that stage of evolution when they can consciously distinguish between egoistic evil and altruistic good. To hope that Evil Egoism can be abolished from the human world, and 'Universal Peace' established, by *eschewal* of active or so-called 'Violent' defence, by calm protest, by what is called 'Passive Resistance', on the part of even a fairly large number, or a whole nation, of human beings, is a vain hope. Vain, because it goes against the indefeasible laws and facts of Metaphysic, the Science of the Eternal and the Infinite, the Science of the Universal Spirit, which co-ordinates all the Sciences of the Finite ; co-ordinates in a way that physical scientists too are beginning to recognise¹.

Evil can never be wholly destroyed by Good ; nor Good by Evil. Both terms of the pair, and of every pair of opposites—and the whole World-Process is made up entirely of such—are always inevitable. But, of course, in any given time-place-circumstance, Peace *may* prevail over War, Pacifist yet resistant Non-violence *may* succeed against Violence ; and, in all times-places-circumstances, wise and right-minded persons *should* strive with all their might, all their heart, mind, soul, that Peace and Non-violence should prevail ; and only when they do not succeed, or see no chance at all of succeeding, should they take to other methods.

The meaning of 'Illusion.'

Freud at one time thought all Religion to be Illusion. He could not understand that his physical body, his un-conscious and its sexual and other appetites, that indeed all this incessantly changing, fleeting, ephemeral world of stars and planets—*because* thus ever-changing, 'ever-becoming,' 'ever-flowing', never fixed, never fixable, always 'passing from Being into Nothing and from Nothing into Being'—is one Vast Infinite Illusion, fundamentally and technically. To Freud, the appetites of the Unconscious—though patently as *arbitrary* as any 'religious superstition', were not an illusion. Cramb, on the other hand, seems to see that "by the same argument you can demonstrate that all glory, and *life itself*, is an illusion and a mockery." Herein he catches a glimpse of the Vedantic Truth (—distorted

¹See Thomson, *An Introduction to Science*, (H.U.L.) and A. Herzberg, *The Psychology of Philosophers*, (International Lib. of Psychology) ; also more recent scientists' works.

by the word 'mockery'—); but he fails to distinguish the various kinds and qualities, all included under the great category, of Illusion, the Relative, made up of Pairs of Opposites; which Relative itself is included, as Its Nature, within the One Absolute, the *Principle* of Consciousness, 'I', 'T', 'I'; is included in, and is at the same time contradistinguished from, It.

Not only technically but factually, actually, obviously, "These cloud-capped towers, these gorgeous palaces, these solemn temples, this great globe itself, yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve, and like all insubstantial pageants faded, leave not a rack behind; truly are we such stuff as dreams are made on"; and not this globe alone, but all these orbs, of planets, suns, and stars, and nebulae, are the same stuff, appearing, vanishing, and reappearing in the One Vast Dream of the Eternal Changeless Consciousness. *But* the Dream, the Illusion, is *not haphazard*; it has an *Order*, is governed by Laws, of Cyclic Periodicity and Recurrence, Action and Reaction, Cause and Effect, Pairs of Opposites, Differentiations and Assimilations. These must not be overlooked.

Because of this failure to see the whole Truth, which 'sets free' from all doubt and error, to see It All and Whole, to realise that there are Distinctions of Opposites and an Order within the Illusion; Cramb cannot reach the Religion of Wisdom and Peace, but falls back, like Nietzsche and Treitschke, upon the Religion of Valor and Power. In the old Samskrit words, the former is the Religion, the Law, for the person of the Brāhmaṇa by *temperament*, (*not* by birth), the Man of Knowledge; the latter, for the person of the Kshatriya *temperament*, (again, *not* by birth), the Man of Action. A Complete Religion, Philosophy, Science, Code of Life, assigns proper places to both, and to two others also, viz., the Religions, Laws, of Commerce and of Industry.

Cramb and Treitschke.

Cramb endeavours, short-sightedly, to do for the British Nation, what Treitschke did for the German. He, alternately, goads them by charging them with, and censuring them for, "apathy", "stolid indifference", "the general meanness and gradually increasing sordidness of English political life", "pretentiousness, over-weening middle-class self-satisfaction, which is not really patriotism ..but an insular narrow conceit";¹

¹Op. cit., pp. 35, 93-94.

and then spurs them to high resolve, by recounting the glorious deeds of their fore-fathers, which have created the 'British Empire'. He also quotes German criticisms of British Imperialism: "You acquired your empire, these critics say, by measureless treachery, violence, the perfidious fomenting of strife, and you have failed as an empire at once in your colonies and in your dependencies..." Then he goes on to show how they "arraign the century and a half of our rule in India. Your dominion, they say, has been retrograde and obscurantist. India is not only the Italy of Asia; it is not only the land of romance, of art and beauty. It is, in religion, earth's central shrine. India *is* Religion. Yet what consciousness of this have Englishmen ever exhibited? You came to India with an opium pipe in one hand and a Bible in the other...Instead of seizing the opportunity for a *new and great religious experiment*, you, the conquerors—borrowers of your own religion—have come to the most original race of this planet, and asked them to borrow from the borrowers !..."¹ And he goes on, in similar lofty strain, for three more eloquent pages. Unfortunately, present-day India is very different from the one pictured in these passages; and her degeneration is due to her own great sins, as well as to the demoralisation and despiritualisation and impoverishment, which are the unavoidable consequences of subjection to a foreign power, and of the growth of slave-mentality; by action and reaction between the inherent sins which made foreign domination possible, and the foreign domination which worsens the slave-mentality. Also, as usual, in adverse criticism, especially when envenomed by 'nationalism' or 'racialism', the vices of Britain (or of Germany, as the case may be) are emphasised overmuch, and the virtues ignored.

Cramb himself does not at all realise the full significance of the words he uses, "a New and great Religious experiment." His highest and final reach therefore, his "Newer World Religion, Newer World Faith," is, the "spiritual" as well as "material" *Empire* of Britain.² And because it "was never more essential than at present that every Englishman should have *some clear conception* of what the words Empire and Imperialism really mean", he explains that "the general aim of British Imperialism" (has been and should be) "To give all men an

¹Op. cit., pp. 23-30.

²Op. cit., pp. 112-113.

English mind.”¹ And, at the very end, because he can see “no issue but a tragic issue”, he exhorts the British Nation to prepare to be “Heroes in battle with heroes”. A saddening conclusion—that with all the wonderful advance of Europe and America in Science, they should remain more primitively or rather savagely animal than the predaceous in Morals.² Everyone in Europe has been saying, since the previous Great War, that Science has far outrun Morals; yet not even the Scientists have been doing anything to stem this deluge of brutal passions, lust, greed, hate, fear, pride, jealousy. Instead, they have sold their souls and their talents, sold for the empty catchword ‘Nationalism,’ to the wire-pullers of their respective nations, for the purposes of making this terrible war ever more terrible.

Moral Equivalents of War and World Order and Religion

The most regrettable feature of Cramb’s work is that he touches the great idea of ‘the Moral Equivalents of War’, and yet fails to grasp it fully. Not surprising, however deeply regrettable. When the Great Mystery, the Principle of all Life and Consciousness, which ideates, wills-and-imagines, dreams, creates, evolves, maintains, devolves, destroys, all these worlds, over and over again, without beginning and without ending; which keeps this Infinite World-Process ever ‘proceeding’, ever running, turning, revolving;—when that Mystery itself has chosen to clothe itself, on this sphere of sorrows, not in the ethereal forms of shining angels, but in the most monstrous, most loathsome, shapes of insects, worms, and beasts, that wallow in mire and scum and slime, in filth, foulness, cloaca; then it is no wonder that It should, even when wearing human shape, indulge in animal lusts and hates, only slightly masked by grandiloquent words. In the course of that eonian process and evolution, from the human standpoint, the time was not ripe, when Cramb wrote, indeed, is not ripe yet, obviously, for human beings, in large numbers, generally, even among the cultured, to ‘know better’. Otherwise, surely, there would not have been, and would not be, the previous and the present Maniacal Wars.

¹Op. cit. p. 122, 125, 127, 128.

²See A. R. Wallace, *Social Environment and Moral Progress*, and recent confessions by leading scientists.

William James, the famous philosopher-psychologist of the U. S. A., coined this fine phrase, 'the Moral Equivalent of War', embodying a very valuable and illuminative thought, only a few years before Cramb wrote. The phrase perhaps did not reach him. The thought behind it is based in thoroughly sound psychology and metaphysic. The 'individualisation' of the Self is accompanied by the dual desire of love as well as hate. Man *must* hate as well as love—so long as he is *an* individual *among* other individuals. Reason, which 'looks before and after, and pines for (the good) that is not,' enables, or should enable, man, to *direct both wisely, towards proper objects*. Otherwise, dire mischief. Unwise lusts, excessive and adulterous multiplication of population, lead to unwise hates and blindly murderous wars. True Culture-Kultur is that which develops the faculty of looking before and after ; of discerning the relations of causes and effects, in the field of psychology as much as in that of physiology ; of seeing ourselves as others see us ; of exercising our unitive, co-operative, submissive, constructive, creative, self-effactive, altruistic instincts, as well as our separative, competitive, destructive, aggressive and self-assertive urges, on *appropriate* objects ; and thus enables human beings to *get on with each other*, sympathetically—as is much more needed that they should, than 'getting on' with frantic rush and speed, on land, sea, air ; whereby they only illustrate the wise proverb, "The more haste, the less speed (in true progress)".

Spiritual Heroism vs. Animal Courage.

Cramb failed to see the whole world of difference between good Illusion and evil Illusion,¹ between the Moral Equivalent

¹All life, all the World-Process, being, technically, an Illusion, as said before, it is necessary, within that life, to hold fast to *good* Illusions and avoid evil ones. The famous Persian poet, Hāfiz, has said well :

Man na mī goyam ke āqil bāsh yā farzána bāsh ;
Har che bāshī, bāsh ; lēkin, andaké dīwāna bāsh.

(I do not say—'be clever or be learned' ;

Be what you please ; but be a *little* mad

Also, (mad after some noble ideal,

Some purpose that is truly really good).

The *Bhakti-Sūtras*, 'Aphorisms on the Love Divine,' make it clear that, for the human being, *bhakti*, passionate love of Divinity, Deity, a great and good Ideal, is the greatest

of War, (or even Defensive therefore Moral War itself), and Immoral (Offensive, aggressive, imperialistic world-dominating) War. "As an illustration of what" he means "by that which stands above reason, ..the beauty,...the transcendental wonder,.. the heroic virtues", which are developed by War, he describes in glowing language, "that incident in the Antarctic Zone," then very recent, "that particular heroism... of Captain Scott and his heroic band", for the discovery of the South Pole. He writes of "that *strange* heroism of Capt. Oates...In the death of Captain Oates, a valour of quite a *different kind* displays itself; in *that* courage you have something *spiritual*, mysterious, added to this *other* courage of the Sagas...And then pass to...that other death (of Captain Scott, in Jan., 1912) ..What are the thoughts which then flicker in front of him? ..We have them written in his own hand in that priceless record", (his Diary, found in Nov., 1912, by a rescue-expedition) ...'The greatness of England—my nation!' It is the greatness of England which uplifts him as death steals over his features like a marble mask.."¹

Cramb sees the clear distinction between the *spiritual*, moral, noble heroism of Scott and Oates, which can belong to truly 'human' beings only (or to animal *mothers* also, at times), and "the *other* courage of the Sagas", which belongs to lions, tigers, warrior-ants, and very many kinds of animals, too. Yet he fails to grasp the real significance of that distinction. The courage of the Sagas becomes spiritualised and sublimed only when exercised by human beings in defence of the weak, (or by animal mothers, in defence of their young). A *sincerely* Non-Violent and yet Resistant Pacifism against *all* war, or any specific war, would certainly have this noble spiritual quality; but, necessarily, such sincerity will be confined to a comparative *few*, and is *very unlikely* to achieve its purpose, except in very rare circumstances, by itself, without help from other causes. It is true that love produces love; and hate, hate; and non-violence will produce non-violence; *but—only* when certain favorable conditions are present. Such moral

shakti, most powerful source of energy. With it, man can achieve anything he aspires after. 'Ideas and Ideals move mankind'. 'Faith can move mountains'.

¹Op. cit., pp. 57-59.

and intellectual progress¹ in evolution, as will make sincere and courageous non-violence possible for a comparative *many*, non-violence which faces and meets death calmly, with gentle pity for the murderer, without lifting a hand against him, even when it is possible to do so effectively—such progress in evolution will already, long before, have made the more brutal forms of war, impossible. At the present day, such Mass-Non-Violence is not possible, on the one hand; and, on the other, would only mean either death or *enslave-ment*².

Advance towards Higher Stages of Evolution, and Wars of Religion, Culture, Imperialism, etc.

But the advance towards that very desirable stage of evolution will not be furthered by such 'world-religion, world-faith,' as Cramb, Nietzsche, and other fanatic Nationalists, and nationalist Churches also, generally, have in mind. "The greatness of England—my nation!"—may have been, indeed, was, right incentive for 'men of action', men of the *Kshatriya*-temperament, like Captains Scott and Oates; and particularly so, when it was incentive to 'spiritual' heroism.

But that an educator, a teacher, a 'Man of Knowledge', a professor, and of history, too, who may well be expected to take broad comprehensive views of the Life-Drama of Humanity on the largest scale—that he should have nothing better to teach to the younger generation than narrow-minded 'nationalism'; should exhort them to substitute a modern savage War of 'English Culture' and 'German Kultur', in place of the medieval savage Wars of Muslim Religion against Christian, Zoroastrian, Jewish, Hindu, and Buddhist Religions, (which still continue in India in the mean and sordid forms of Hindu-Muslim 'communal riots'),—this is indeed deplorable.

When British and German Professors and educators of the young behave like this, what wonder that British and

¹The theme is developed in the present writer's book, *The Science of the Emotions*.

²More may be said, later, perhaps, in this book, in connection with the Tolstoian views of Non-Violence preached by Mahatma Gandhi.

³Serious outbreaks are reported, as this is being written, in the papers of the third week of March, 1941, in Dacca, Azamgarh, etc.

German politicians and rulers should behave as they are doing? 'Scientists' actively *helped* the previous Great War, and are actively *helping* this; instead of trying might and main to *prevent* such disasters.

Treitschke said: "Just as the greatness of Germany is to be found in the governance of Germany by Prussia, so the greatness and good of the world is to be found in the predominance there, of German culture, of the German mind, in a word, of the German character."¹ Cramb, not to be outdone in such bounding and plunging and buckjumping, promptly substitutes the word 'English' for the word 'German'. Not even such imperialist 'bounders', (so H. G. Wells describes them in his *History*, as do some other modern writers also), as Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon, and other 'conquerors', seem to have consciously thought of doing so; though, no doubt, each left lasting marks, some useful, some harmful, on the countries he raided. It is all only the blind egoist brute-instinct of carnal self-multiplication, self-assertion, self-imposition, polygamy, polyprogeny; only in a less coarse and more garish, grandiose, and murderous form.

Wherein is the Distinctiveness of 'National' Mind or Culture?

And what, after all, is "the English mind", or "the German mind", or "character"? All sorts, all types, of mind, of character, good and bad, noble and ignoble, virtuous and vicious, meritorious and criminal, literary, scientific, philosophic, artistic, war-minded, money-minded, are to be found in England, in Germany, and in all the other 'civilised' countries. Even those aspects of 'character' which depend solely upon the work of the barber, the tailor, the house-builder, the town-planner, the cook and delicatessen-maker—even these fashions in moustache, beard, hair, dress, eating, housing, laying out of streets and parks, after invention in one country, spread rapidly to all others; and the inventions are by no means confined to any one country. 'All nations now, by means of science, in one another's being mingle'. More; if any nation ever had any distinctive type of mind, at any time in the past, has it continued unchanged down to this day? Obviously 'John Bull' of a hundred years ago, is not to be found in Britain today, except perhaps in some very rural out-of-the-way farms and country-seats.

¹Op. cit., p. 112.

The Need for Clear Conceptions.

Cramb says¹ that there was never a period when it was more essential...that every Englishman should have some *clear conception* of what the words Empire and Imperialism really mean..." And he is so glamourised by his own eloquence, that he believes that he has given, to every Englishman, that very desirable possession, when he has said, that to impose "the English mind"—an exceedingly obscure, indeed senseless conception—upon the universe, is the meaning of Empire and Imperialism. Obviously he is no more clear-headed, no more liberal-minded, no more large-hearted than Treitschke, who wished to impose "the German mind" upon the universe.

Airy Sentiment and Earthy Appetite.

While Treitschke and Cramb and their ilk represent and expound the 'sentimental and airy' meaning of Empire and Imperialism, the cunning politicians, financiers, entrepreneurs, of each country, have their eyes shrewdly fixed on the 'practical and earthy' meaning of it. They are not so much concerned with 'giving' any 'mind', (except in the way of *exploiting* such 'nationalist sentiment' for their own selfish purposes), as with *taking* as much 'matter' as they can get hold of, money, raw materials, markets, for themselves primarily, and their 'country' secondarily, from all other countries, by subtle diplomatic or violent martial methods, according as the other countries are comparatively strong or weak.

Present Relevancy of these Observations.

That the considerations advanced, so far, in connection with the writings of long deceased German and English writers, are not 'out of date' in the very least, may appear from the following, (*Hindustan Times*, 22. 3. 1941): "The *Times* (London, 15. 3. 1941) publishes the following cable, d/. 12. 3. 1941, from the German frontier: 'Neither Germany nor Italy have the least intention of tolerating the attempt at World-Dictatorship or recognising the arrogation by the Anglo-Saxon of the right to Police the World, or acquiescing in the United States' self-appointed role of World-Arbitrator. Mr. Matsuoka's (Japanese Minister's) visit to Berlin and Rome ought to make this quite clear....The Lease and Lend Bill (passed in the U. S. A., a few days before)...constitutes an abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine. Everybody knows

it must *prolong the war*, but this is precisely what its advocates intended. Financially and politically it means *very good business* for the U. S. A., which is obviously taking advantage of Great Britain's extremity, and is counting on the acquisition of more and more British bases. Besides, the longer the war lasts, the greater will be the United States' inheritance in the fast disintegrating British Empire....The measure has not taken us by surprise; so that all requisite steps have been taken for frustrating its immediate purpose. In his last public declaration, the Fuhrer told the world that all vessels carrying war materials, which attempted to approach Great Britain would be sunk". And air-bombing of Britain, and sinking of her ships, by Germany, and retaliation by Britain, began again, with redoubled violence, in the second week of March, 1941. Thus are 'sentiment' and 'business' combined in all countries. In India, the Governor-General and provincial Governors and lower officials have been similarly appealing to 'sentiment' as well as 'business', in public speeches; also, to 'fear', of invasion of India by Japan or Germany. They say that 'Britain is fighting for the freedom of the world', and that 'the war helps Indian industries'. But the speeches fall flat. All the Political and Communal Parties and Business Associations are pointing out, that India herself is being denied 'freedom', and all 'industries' are strictly controlled by Government, and private enterprise is not being given due chance. They *all* want the *immediate* establishment of a 'National Government', though they differ as to minor details. As to 'fear', *helpless* India has become fatalist—accustomed to earthquakes, epidemics, famines.

Teach Benign World Order, not Malign Imperialism.

Those who profess to be highly cultured and moral Educators of men, should have the rationality, the benevolence, bene-science, bene-ficence, to feel, to see, to teach, that the meaning of Empire and Imperialism *now*, (whatever it may have been in the past), is nothing else than vulgarian and disastrous conceit, arrogance, avarice, land-grabbing, market-monopolising, money-raking, and the spread of hatred, fear, jealousy, distrust, espionage, oppression, terrorism, all round. They should teach, with all their power of feeling, of intellect, of speech, that what the world needs today, is *not* imbecile war between 'Culture' and 'Kultur'; *not* a vulgar rivalry in strutting and striding about with swelled heads, puffed-out chests, noses in the air, as *proprietors* of *Empires*;

not the 'wild waste, in each day's bout of triple war, of the long-hoarded wealth of kings and nations'.

Teach Syn-thesis and Emulation; Not Anti-thesis and Jealousy.

They should all, of all nations, combine to proclaim, that what the world needs today, urgently, vitally, in order to *survive*, to escape annihilation, is a *Synthesis* of *all* that is *best* in all the better portions of all sorts of minds, English and also German, Arabian and also Persian and Turkish, Indian and also Chinese, North American and also Russian, French and also Italian, Hispano-Portuguese and South American and also Japanese. And they should recommend and encourage, *within* such a Synthesis, a noble *Emulation*, by each group, community, nation, State, in the work of promotion of the *General Welfare* of All Mankind, and of all good, useful, fine, Sciences and Arts, for *sub-serving* that Welfare. They should not seek to enjoy, or persuade others to wish to enjoy, the morbid pleasure, the diseased excitement, of witnessing, or directly acting as, 'heroes in murderous brutal battle with heroes', and, far worse, *dastar* 'heroes' dropping bombs on, or driving tanks over, defenceless and fleeing civilian men, women, children.

Patently, each country has produced, and today possesses, and can produce more, great scientists, great philosophers, great poets, great artists in all arts, i. e., all the Culture-and-Kultur-makers; also great 'heroes' of defensive War and generous Finance and beneficent Commerce. Why then cannot those of such as are living today, all *co-operate*, for the good of all human beings, themselves included; instead of *competing* in the work of Culture-and-Kultur-breakers and hastening the destruction of all the peoples of the earth?

Wanted - Clear Conceptions of Swa-raj and World Order.

Our Education should certainly be able to see that it is much more essential, *now*, for every human being who can think and understand at all, to have a *clear conception*, (1) of the *terribly mischievous meaning* of Empire, Imperialism, Fascism, Nazism, Bolshevism, Capitalism, *Pseudo-Socialism*, etc., on the one hand; and, (2) on the other, of what *Good-Self-Government* or *Good-Swa-raj* or *Good-Demo-cracy* or *Genuine Socialism*, means, implies, requires; what it is constituted by; how it can be secured; what sort of Social Structure, International Federation, World Order, is best for Humanity and promotes *alliance* and *co-operation* between *all* nations;

what is the World Religion which *synthesises* and *reconciles* all religions and social structures, most nearly satisfies all heads and hearts, and meets best, the requirements of both Egoism and Altruism, Individualism and Communism, Happiness Here and Happiness Hereafter.¹

**Frenzied Finance and Frantic Fighting ;
Vicious Education and Vaulting Ambitions.**

Defective, nay, vicious, Education, on the one side, vicious, culturally, and very defective, vocationally;² and limitless overweening ambitions, individualist, nationalist, capitalist, imperialist, militarist, on the other ; these are the cause of all the furious, economic as well as martial, fighting, tusk and horn, tooth and nail and tail, fang and claw, beak and talon, sting and sucker, between rival millionaires and contending States, Triple Alliances and Triple Ententes, Triple Axis and Triple Segments - that we have been witnessing incessantly since the beginning of the twentieth century.

In this spectacle, the see-saw, of triumph and humiliation, is incessantly tilting up and down and shifting lift and

¹Even H. G. Wells, with all his distrust of Religion, (and perfectly right distrust, nay disgust, of it, if and when it means professional priestcraft), has a glimpse of what genuine Religion should and can do. In a passage quoted in the *Leader* of 19.3.1941, from some writing of his, he says : "Religion, modern and disillusioned, has for its outward task to set itself to the control and direction of political, social, and economic life. If it does not do that, it is no more than a drug for easing discomfort, the opium of the people." This says, in terms intelligible to the modern mind, what the ancient *Vaisheshika-Sūtra* says in Samskr̥t :

यतः अभ्युदय-निःश्रेयस-सिद्धिः स धर्मः ।

"[D]harma, Religion-Law-Righteousness-Right-and-Duty, leads to Happiness, (Rise-Prosperity-Welfare) Here, and to the Supreme Bliss Hereafter."

²The subject of Education is dealt with at length, in the present writer's *The Science of Social Organisation*, Vols. I and II, (a third in preparation). The experiments in vocational education, according to temperament and natural aptitude, that have been and are being made, in Russia, U. S. A., Britain, and elsewhere, are also described in the book, and compared with the ancient Indian system and methods.

sinkage from one end to the other. Also, to vary the figure, the pieces on the international chess-board, are varying, intermixing, changing sides, with bewildering rapidity.

The See-saw ; the Chess-board ; and Animal-fables.

The Individual, the nation, that owns hoarded millions, and milliards (i. e., U. S. A. and French 'billions') of dollars or pounds, today, is an indebted pauper, with 'estates encumbered,' tomorrow ; and vice versa. The accumulations, by fair means or (mostly) foul, of many generations, disappear, within weeks and months, from one firm or country to reappear in another ; like mountains of sand under the blast of the Sahara-n simoom ; witness the relations of Britain and the U. S. A. after eighteen months of the New World War ; and the fate of the vast gold-holdings of France, Belgium, and other countries.

The Allies of today are the Enemies of tomorrow ; and vice versa ; as portrayed, for at least long centuries, if not for all time, with un-excelled political experience and insight, by Chāṇakya-Vishṇu-Sharmā, contemporary with Aristotle ; in that immortal work, the *Pancha-tantra*, written some 2300 years ago ; (or its much later re-arrangement, the *Hitopadeśha*, by Nārāyaṇa) ; in the guise of animal-fables, of mice, pigeons, cats, ichneumons, jackals, vultures, peacocks, swans, lions, tigers, bulls, snakes, herons, frogs, turtles, crows, eagles, fishes, crocodiles, bears, and monkeys.¹ It is very sad that the rulers of nations continue to behave in this Age of Science, like these animals ; and have not yet learnt to behave as true

¹The originals of a number of these fables are to be found in the far earlier *Mahā-bhārata*, some 5000 years old, by tradition. All past history and the daily press supply illustrations enough, of these changings of sides and views. Still, L. Fischer's *Stalin and Hitler*, a small book of five chapters, makes, as a whole, a very good 'study' in "sharp alterations of policy" and lightning changes in propaganda. The whole book seems an impartial account of the vices of Imperialist Democracy, as also, of course, of Nazism, Fascism, and Bolshevism. Incidentally, it proves conclusively, that the partition of Poland between Russia and Germany. in September, 1939, (which, at the time, was generally thought to have been a *coup* of Stalin's, and forced upon Hitler). was actually all arranged and agreed upon, beforehand, between the two.

human beings. The national flags of many of the 'Great Powers' bear animal figures, still ; like the totems of savages.

**Interesting Drama for some ; Agonising Death
for others.**

It all makes very interesting, very exciting and exhilarating, life-drama, for 'war-like' heroes, and for 'money-and-luxury-like' capitalists ; but it is very distressful reality for the 'slave-like' drudges, the 'sub-jects', the 'thrown under and trampled upon'. It does not make for a Rational World Order, in which the 'war-like' and the 'peace-like', the 'art-and-letters-and-science-like', the 'business-like', and 'the honest-plod-and-simple-work-like', could all have what they 'liked'—in reasonable degree. Battling with the wilder moods and aspects of so-called 'in-animate' Nature ; hunting and slaying predaceous of land, water, air ; combating and suppressing the criminal-minded ; and even holding 'joyous tournaments' if they liked—for one type. Communing with Nature in her smiling and benignant moods ; rejoicing in her beauties ; coaxing her secrets from her, with prolonged and hard wooing ; rearing, domesticating, and fostering affectionate birds, fishes, animals of beauty of form and color, of song, of milk, and of many other uses and delights ; creating new forms of richer fruits, vegetables, cereals—for another type. Producing and distributing necessities, comforts, luxuries—for a third type. Doing simple, plodding, unskilled or little-skilled work, under the guidance of others—for a fourth type. All rationally planned out, and purposefully educated for, according to the temperament and vocational aptitude of each educand ; not left to blind competition and gambling chances.

"It is not our business to collect trophies ; but to try if we can bring back the world to peaceful habits"—so wrote Viscount Castlereagh, in 1815, after Waterloo, to the then Prime Minister of Britain, the Earl of Liverpool.¹ But if either Churchill or Hitler or Mussolini or Stalin or any Japanese or other imperialist, as such, in 'propria persona', or in the mask of Nazist, Fascist, Bolshevik, or Communist, insist on 'collecting trophies' and shouting 'World-Dominion', and singing 'Deutscheland uber alles' or 'Britannia rules the waves' ; then, indeed, in modern conditions, world-dominion is not likely to accrue to any one, but 'world-downfall' is very likely to drag down all.

¹Londonderry, op. cit., p. vi.

Perhaps, the Mystery wills such downfall of the overgrown leviathans. Perhaps the ante-diluvian saurians grew monstrous in bulk at the expense of the smaller animals; perhaps they almost emptied the lands and the waters of these; and then, perhaps, they ate up one another; and so the smaller life got a chance to multiply again. Biological evolutionists have thus described the alternate increase and decrease of tigers and deer in specific tracts. The homely but very wise English proverb also says that "when thieves fall out, honest men prosper". When militarists and imperialists destroy each other, then the humble folk have a chance to live; unless indeed, the destruction is so devastating that Dark ages supervene over whole Continents.

In Indian history, or story, some 5000 years ago, India was a mass of small 'city-states,' somewhat like those of Greece, but mostly ruled by kings; as, in fact, are the Indian States of today. Somehow, they seem to have been very populous and very prosperous. Then the kings and the heads of republics, (for there were all sorts of 'forms of government'¹) grew militarist; "and the earth groaned under the burden of the general population on the one hand, and the vast armies of the kings on the other." Kṛṣṇa's republican statesmanship flung these vast hordes of soldiers against each other on the great plains near modern Delhi. More than four million soldiers and their kings, (who led their armies themselves in those days), slaughtered each other in eighteen days. Yudhishtira was left behind as Pyrrhic victor in the Maha-bhārata War. He slowly re-constructed his own broken State and Society; also those of the other slain kings and chiefs, whose legitimate successors he appointed in their places. The established custom, in those times, was for the Overlord or Sovereign (Chakra-varṭī or Sam-rāt) of the Holy 'Indian' Empire, to take some tribute, as mark of acknowledgment of his authority, and of their organic responsibility, as members, to him as head, of that Organism of the Empire; and, in all ordinary respects, to let the States autonomously administer their own affairs; as 'constitutional' mon-archies, mostly, 'limited' by the *'authoritative advice'* of

¹ Ēka-rājya, or mon-archies; dvai-rajyas or di-archies, like those of Sparta; sangha-rajyas or republics; gaṇa-rājyas or oligarchies; sām-rājyas or empires; bhaujyas or regencies; vai-rājyas or non-archies or ideal 'an-archies', are mentioned in the old books.

the *puro-hiṭa-manṛi-s*, 'councillors put-forward (by the people),' like the Ephors; or, in a few cases, as republics or oligarchies. Yudhishthira carried out this re-construction on the lines of the ancient four-fold Social Organisation, in accordance with the instructions of the very old 'Grandfather' Bhishma. But militarism was not quite destroyed yet. It lifted up a menacing head again, within Kṛishṇa's own republic or oligarchy of Dwārakā (modern Kathiawar and Gujerat). Then, thirty-six years after the Great War, his people, the Yādavas, five hundred thousand powerful turbulent fighting men, some of them the most renowned of that age of personal prowess, all perished in one afternoon's mad wild drunken mêlée on the sands of the sea-shore, where they had gone for a holiday feast. After that, India seems to have had comparative peace for some 2500 years, (by inference, from the maxim that 'happy times have no history', though 'dark ages' too have none). Then the Buddha came to re-generate the again corrupted Dharma; and gave to India a renaissance which lasted for over a thousand years.

Such is the oft-repeated general course of human history, for each 'race', 'nation', 'civilisation', 'religion', with endless variations in the particular details; birth, distinctive appearance at a geographical centre, with some peculiarities of thinking, feeling (desiring), willing (acting); rise, growth, maturity, optimum; excesses, dissipations, diseases, decrepitude, death; rebirth in another form. In the present case, the Second War which is to complete the unfinished work of the First, viz., the destruction of Militarism, has come after only twenty-five years, instead of thirty-six. Life is faster in the Kali-Yuga, the Age of Conflict.

CHAPTER VII

"MAKE PEACE".

"Desire Friendship ; not Victory."

It were well for present-day mankind, especially in Europe, its decay would be postponed, its healthy life would be greatly prolonged, if, before it becomes too late, Britain and Germany, both, throw off their imperialist madness, come to an amicable agreement, forgive and forget the past, and fraternise, as they should ; since both are truly cousins, off-shoots of the same Indo-Aryan, Indo-European, root-stock. 'Let not the sun of civilisation go down upon your anger'.

Both nations stand on the very topmost 'rung of modern civilisation ; together with the French ; who are as near to the British as to the Germans, territorially, biologically, politically, intellectually.

Charlemagne was the common 'ancestral' emperor of both the Eastern and the Western 'Franks', who, later on, became the Germans and the French, respectively. And William, 'the Conqueror' of Britain, and his successors, were Norman Franks, and most of the more ancient families of the 'aristocracy' of Britain are descended from the Normans who went to Britain with William. The British royal House of Windsor was the House of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, up to twenty-five years ago.

All the three, British, French, German, have, to their credit, the greatest achievements of western Literature, Science, Art.

France has been broken, for the time, (as also Italy seems to be, practically, at the end of March, 1941), in the current war. If Britain and Germany continue to maim and mangle each other, civilisation is mutilated and crippled in Europe. It may live on in Russia and America ; if these avoid being dragged outright into the war. But it does not seem likely that they will be able to do so, if the war continues much longer.

If the two mighty chief belligerents decide to let bygones be bygones, if they determinately shut the doors of memory upon 'the blood and tears', 'the old unhappy far-off things and battles', of the past, clasp strong hands in fast friendship with each other, and co-operate, in the true philanthropic spirit, in the future, they could lift the British and the German Peoples,

and all the other Peoples too of the teeming earth, to heights unscaled before ; they could indeed bring heaven to this earth ; instead of pouring out upon it, hell, as they are doing now.

Because that 'precious' thing, 'prestige', or 'self-respect', (how men deceive themselves with enphuistic names for what is nothing else than their 'hard pride', hardened by lust and greed), will not permit either belligerent to make any advance, first ; except on his own terms, which the other will feel bound to reject, even if wholly reasonable ; and human nature is such that when passions become highly excited and make two heads very hot, a cool third head is indispensable to mediate ; therefore, the only way out seems to be for those giants, the U. S. A. and Russia, to intervene ; in the interests of World Peace and World Prosperity ; for their own sake as well as that of all others ; instead of themselves sliding, as they are unfortunately doing, nearer and nearer to the edge of the Maelstrom, and running ever-increasing risk of being sucked in wholly at any moment.

The U. S. A. and Russia ought to say to the belligerents : 'Please adjourn, *sine die*, all further war-operations, from such and such an hour on such and such a date. Let us all call together an International Conference, of the most famous, and at the same time most *humanist*, non-nationalist, rationalist, and *philanthropist Scientists*, (*not* expertists, *nor* diplomatists) of *all* nations. Let us lock them up as a jury ; and tell them that they will not be allowed to go home, until they have agreed upon a Scheme of World Order, which will ensure necessities, comforts, also hobbies, which are the real luxuries, according to tastes, and needs, to all who are willing to work to their best abilities. Let us tell them: Everyone is saying that Mother Earth already produces more than enough for all ; that it is only mal-distribution and non-distribution, wanton waste and deliberate destruction of goods, caused by short-sighted ruthless inhuman greeds and lusts, which is causing all these horrors of war. You, our wisest Scientists (and remember that *Wisdom* means knowledge of Nature in general, and of Human Nature, both good and evil, in particular ; *but Knowledge* which is *inspired* by active *Philanthropy*) ; you, the Nature-appointed Teachers of the Human Race, endowed by her with the Intelligence which can make sure of the Right Ends and Aims, and find the Right Ways and Means, you can, surely show to us the way of *equitable distribution* ; and can also milk the universal

Mother Earth¹ of much more sweet and wholesome milk of many kinds, than she is already giving. Please do so. We, your willing and respectful students, will not allow you to go home; but will keep you locked up here until you do so'.

If this is done, if such a Conference of Scientists is called and locked up, the needed Scheme of the *New World Order*, which will solve all human problems, will be forthcoming within a very few weeks.

Platitudes, Evasions, Self-deceptions, and Other-deceptions.

The Hindustan Times, 29. 3. 1941, reports that the Japanese Minister, Mr. Matsuoka, during his visit to Berlin, had a two and a half hours' interview with Herr Hitler on 27. 3. 1941; and, on the previous evening, in a broadcast message to the German Nation, "gave the assurance that Japan will not lag behind Germany in courage and determination to establish the *World* on the basis of a *New Order*". And he went on to say, as explanation of what 'New Order' means: "The ideal which is dear to the Japanese above all things is embodied in *Nakho Ishio*, a harmonious world community, with room for all nations in which they can realise their wishes and fulfil their missions". The reader will readily see that this explanation is a pious, sanctimonious, diplomatic 'platitude', of exactly the same kind as British Ministers also are uttering from time to time. One speech of Lord Halifax, in the U. S. A., has been quoted before (p. 114). In a more recent one, in New York, on 25. 3. 1941, (pub. in *H. Times*, 27. 3. 1941), he again "defined Britain's war and peace aims as (1) *winning the war*, (2) preventing the repetition of such a tragedy, (3) and helping to ensure future prosperity justly shared". How items 2 and 3 are to be achieved, he never thought of explaining. He went on to define "the Nazi system as bondage, bodily, spiritual, political, and economic, and said Hitler's *New Order* would divide the world into Germans as the master race and the other nations as second class people... Already Hitler is scheming to overrun great tracts of Africa and Asia". Hitler's and other German leaders' speeches, as published by the British press, say, in effect, that what the British Statesmen say the Germans *would* do, the British *have already done*. "Lord Halifax said: The American conti-

¹See in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, the story of the 'Milking of the Earth,' by King Prthu, with the help of the Sages.

nent...could be attacked;...The doors of 'trade in Europe, Asia, and Africa would be closed to America, except on terms laid down by Germany". How much of this 'danger to America' suits American Big Business, and the Lend and Lease policy; how much is mere 'electioneering, and diplomatic, claptrap'; how much is genuine; heaven only knows; or the 'diplomats' and 'Big Business men' who are 'in the know'. Lord Halifax said: "This struggle is a mortal one between two philosophies". The general public holds the notion that the *two* philosophies, 'Imperialist Democratism' and 'Nationalist Socialism', are much the same; and that the mortal struggle is not between any two 'philosophies' or 'ideologies'; (so far as Britain and Germany are concerned; and even Soviet Russia has changed *its* 'ideology' into something which now bears a very considerable likeness to the other two); but between two bands or gangs of philosophers; whose *one* 'half-truth' philosophy is that which was discovered and spoken out plainly, by the 'plain man in the street', long, long, before Darwin and Wallace and Spencer 'discovered' it and dressed it up in scientific robes and crowned it as the Law of Evolution reigning over the whole Universe; viz., 'Let him take who has the *Power*, and let him keep who *can*'. This is the single *Power*-philosophy, *Power*-Politics, *Power*-Religion, that is not *e*-volving, but *de*-volving, 'the most advanced and *civilised* nations' of the present day, back into the brute. Incidentally, thoughtful scientists are discovering their mistake in giving autocratic powers to this Law, and are trying to 'limit' and 'constitutionalise' its mon-archy, by bringing it under the control of a Council of other very important Laws—unfortunately, very late.

Well, Lord Halifax went on producing many more smooth phrases, made up of 'many words of little meaning, but of pompous sound'. He said, "*When* the great battle was won, the nations which preserved or regained their *freedom*", (blessed word!) "*would have* the *sovereign opportunity* to show *what freedom means*, and *what it can do* for the welfare of mankind. It was *not* possible *now* to draw detailed plans for the future structure of the community of nations." And so on, and so forth. Poor, unlucky, 'Freedom'!. No nation had 'preserved or regained' or possessed it in the past! Unhappy nations! If any did possess it, at all, they never had a chance before, of showing 'what freedom means'! Perhaps, there is the solitary exception—

of the British Nation, whose Government has shown to India 'what freedom means'; not least during the Viceroyalty of the then Lord Irwin, now Lord Halifax, the pious 'tall, thin, Christian', as Maulana Mohamed Ali called him at the Round Table Conference in London, in 1932. Alas!, as Sir R. Acland has felt and said, (pp. 9, 77, *supra*). *real* Christianity cannot carry Diplomacy on its shoulders.

Mr. Churchill, on the other hand, is nothing if not frankly outspoken. He seldom minces matters. Burdened with Premiership, he cannot help falling under the spell of the prevailing atmosphere of 'diplomacy', to a greater or lesser extent. Still he bursts out from it, from time to time. On 27. 3. 1941, in the course of his address to the Central Council of the National Union of Conservative Associations, he did not disdain to use the common claptrap, and said: "We work together with the single aim of *saving Europe and the world* from the curse and tyranny of Nazism"; but he added that "Because of the interests of national unity, he *refrained* from producing a catalogue of War Aims and Peace Aims. Every one will catalogue what will be the exact settlement of affairs in the period which, as I see, is unforeseeable. If you attempt to do that, you will find that, the moment you leave the arena of *pious platitude*, you descend into the arena of *heated controversy*. That would militate against the efforts we are making".

This means plainly that, now that the war *has been* started, rightly or wrongly, by the imperialist 'diplomats', and the British People *are in it*, willy-nilly; that People are at one, are in 'national unity', in this one respect alone, that they cannot allow themselves to be defeated by the Germans; and that they are *not at all at one* as to *what* is the *real meaning* of "saving Europe and the world from...Nazism". We have seen before that the *better* side of Nazism, (i. e., its 'constructive' 'social-improvement' side, as distinguished from its *worse*, 'destructive' but from its own standpoint, indispensable, 'war-preparation' side), is appearing in Britain, too, already, in the guise of 'Emergency Socialism', (pp. 105-107 *supra*).

The nett conclusion is that the two great nations are locked in death-grapple, simply for *lack of clear understanding, in detail*, of "what Freedom means", what the "New World Order" should be, *how*. "Europe and the world can be saved". *Why* is it necessary to wait for a clear understanding of, and on, these matters, till *after* some one

has *won* the war? Instead, it is this detail, in broad main outlines, at least, that is *vitally important* to publish *now*, at once, *beforehand*, in order to set at rest all doubts and distrust, and *stop the war*, and secure *real, stable, rational unity*, between *all* nations, instead of the very false and very unstable, irrational, merely emotional unity, *within each* nation, and *against* other nations, which is temporarily brought about by '*nationalist slogans*'. And it is just this detailed statement, that all politicians, of all countries, but some more, some less, are studiously *evading* and *avoiding*.

And the case is exactly the same, in India, as between the differing political and religio-political parties, the leaders of all of which are crying for 'Swaraj', 'Freedom', 'Independence', 'Self-government', 'Nationalist government'; while each party-leader has a different meaning up his sleeve, or none at all.

British Reprovers of such Evasions.

The views of the Labor Party of Britain; of M. P.'s like Sir R. Acland and H. Dalton; of very influential front rank writers like H. G. Wells and B. G. Shaw (who also sent a letter to the British Press so early as Oct. 1839, asking "Self-sacrifice—Yes; but *What for?*"); of new writers like W. B. Curry; of the leaders of the Indian National Congress, as well as of some other Indian Political Parties; have been quoted before. They are all unanimous in their reprobation of the evasion, by the British Government, of all definite intelligible statement of their War-and-Peace-Aims, and the endless repetition of mere 'promises', and those too of the vaguest, most piously platitudinous, elusive sort. Thomas Carlyle, in *The Hero as King*, has written rightly: "A man *whose word* will *not inform* you at all *what he means*, or *will do*, is not a man you can bargain with. You must get out of that man's way; or put him out of yours!" And this last piece of Carlyle's advice is what all the nations are unhappily trying to follow today, in their relations with, or, rather, against, each other—the *reductio ad absurdum* of much-boasted much-vaunted 'Practicality'!

It is for Britain and Germany to show the way to the Real Practicality which is identical with Honesty and Equitability. They can show the Right Way to all the Nations, by *making Peace, now*, between themselves, between Britain and India, between Japan and China; not '*after the war*'—for that '*after*' will *not* come at all, otherwise; in the deepest sense; for the war will *never* be extinguished entirely, but

will keep smouldering beneath even the ashes of the two nations, and will keep blazing up again and again, whenever any fresh fuel falls upon those ashes.

Peace at Home means Peace Abroad.

MAKE PEACE ! therefore, now, at once !

But Peace between the belligerents has a pre-requisite. All you, who are powerful, '*Set your own house in order*', first ; then you will be able successfully to help others, the weaker ones, to set theirs in order, too. If your own hands are dirty, how can you wash others' hands clean ? If your own heart is impure, how can you make others' hearts pure ? If you are not yourself willing to share equitably, how can you make others willing to do so ? Listen to what a naturalised Briton, by all available signs honest and competent, K. Zilliacus, already quoted before, says on the intimate connection between *Internal Peace and Order* and *External Peace and Order*. He writes in his book, which should be read in full by all concerned, *Between Two Wars*, (pub : 1939, before the New World War began) :—

"The plutocracy pushed the Government into economic nationalism and rearmament. Hence the failure of the Economic and Disarmament Conferences (p. 133)...The plutocracy are clinging not only to their *profits*, but to the *power, dignity, leisure* and privilege, that come to them through their profits¹...Establishing *economic peace at home* is a *prior condition* to the attainment of *peaceful internationalism*..*Social Justice* is part of the *price of Peace*(32-36)...We are living in an epoch when history is being

¹Presumably, Mr. Zilliacus is unaware that he has brought together, here, the four 'psychical' *incentives*, urges, 'appetites', ambitions, that are behind all human effort, according to the old Indian Psychology. See App. C. 'Privilege' is partly 'dignity' or 'honor', and partly 'power'; leisure means 'hobbies', 'amusements', 'play'. The chapters (23, 24, and the last) which deal with 'Incentives', how to induce persons to work their best, in accordance with the Socialist maxim, 'From all as they (best) can, to all as they need', are the weakest in G. B. Shaw's fine book, *Guide to Socialism*. He ends with what is practically a lament to the effect that there is no effective way apparent to create a world-wide 'will-to-equality' and 'will-to-wisdom'. There is plenty of will-to-laze, will-to-shirk, will-to-enjoy, will-to-misappropriate, will-to-power, and 'will-to-victory'! Of this last even President Roosevelt has been talking. There

made; and there is, today, a greater volume of unhappiness than at any other time within living memory, not excluding the World War. In the last analysis, most of our present discontents can be traced back to the growing *difficulties*, since the (previous World) War, of the *economic and social Order* based on private enterprise (18-19)...

"J. A. Hobson, (in his book) *Property and Improperly*, (says): 'It may be quite true that...pride, prestige, pugnacity, and power¹ are the directly operative *motives* with which ambitious dictators goad their respective peoples into foreign exploits; but this does not dispose of the fact that *economic conflicts* relating to property and its ownership and use *within* each country are the *main causes* of those *competing tariffs, armaments, and foreign policies* which menace world peace...The real source of trouble lurks in...the insistence of the owning classes to cling to their *rights of property*, and to utilise those rights in such ways as to breed class and international discord'...(35—36)...The National Government do not like the drift to war, but they live by not stopping it

is practically nowhere any will-to-equality! Emerson has said: "Our chief want in life is somebody who shall make us do what we can" (i. e., the *best* we really can). Shaw, and a host of others, have only been saying the same thing, in other words. None suggests the remedy. The Ancient Indian Scheme of Social Organisation shows the way. *Honor, Power, Wealth, Amusement*—these are the *four main* *psychical incentives* of human beings; in, and during, the egoist and individualist aspect, and period, of life. *Partition* them *equitably* between the four types of human beings, and the four corresponding vocations or professions, (1) the learned, (2) the executive, (3) the commercial, (4) the industrial. *That* will *induce* each type to put forth its best. Unpartitioned, unregulated, they cause all sorts of war. Scores of writers in the west, even those who are ranked among the most thoughtful of the day, like B. Russell, Shaw, Wells, etc. are constantly using such words as those in the quotation, 'dignity, power, profits, leisure', or their equivalents, Honor, etc., in dealing with the Social Dis-order of the time. They *do not realise the full psychological implications*. Hence the ineffectiveness of their suggestions.

¹These four are only aspects of 'power'; though 'pride' and 'prestige' fall partly under 'honor', love of 'name and fame', also.

(42) ..By this time, so much of what was secret in 1917—1921 has come to light, that we know all about the *motives* of the governing class at that time, and about what they were capable of, in the way of both self-deception and deliberate duplicity, at the promptings of those motives. ..The same motives are once more operating (43). 'The interests of the British democracy do not conflict at any point with the interests of mankind ; the *interests* of the *British governing classes* conflict at many points with the interests of mankind'—(so writes Bertrand Russell in his book, *The Foreign Policy of the Entente*)...The Government also committed themselves to taking the lion's share of Germany's *colonies*. At the same time they solemnly vowed in public that they did not want an inch of territory. They exploited Wilson, fooled the workers, fought the Russian Revolution, and prolonged the World War in a successful struggle to frustrate the common *people's desire to put an end to Imperialism and power politics* (48—53). The allied Governments never dreamed of keeping faith with Germany, Wilson, or their own peoples, (60—61)...*All these assurances and promises*, without exception, were *false* (69). In the eyes of our *rulers*, the *workers* have no right to know what they are dying for;¹ their only duty is to be cannon-fodder (81)...This duplicity alternated with bursts of cynical candour (108).

"...Why have the National Government reduced us to this plight ?...Why have they destroyed collective security ?...The reason then and today was that the *Government* were the *tool of capitalist vested interests*, and *identified their class fears and hates* with the *vital interests* of the *nation*....It is by no means sufficiently realised that exactly the same influences determine the Government's foreign and defence policies. These policies are what they are because they put the *class interest* of the *plutocracy* before any other consideration. Most of the *City* have all along been *against economic internationalism, against disarmament, and*

¹They are being told today that they are dying for 'freedom', the 'freedom of the World', or at least of Europe. "We know not what 'twas all about, But 'twas a famous victory"; so a British poet has written about an old 'Battle of Blenheim'. But Labor in Britain (let us hope in Germany and other countries also) is now calling, more or less loudly, for a declaration of War-and-Peace Aims.

vehemently for every *Fascist aggressor* since 1931. Their 'line' has always been followed by most of the *Tory Party* and of the *National Government*. The *plutocracy* pushed the Government into *economic nationalism* and *rearmament*. Hence the failure of the Economic and Disarmament Conferences. The latter failed also for the political reasons mentioned below.

"When Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931, the National Government deliberately connived at the aggression for a definite purpose. They regretted that Japan had started, but seeing she had, considered it a lesser evil to do a deal with Japan on the basis of condoning her aggression, than to co-operate with the U.S.A., the League, and the U.S. S.R., to stop Japanese aggression. That was because a victory for China would have meant the triumph of the anti-imperialist Chinese national movement, and a revolution in Japan. This would have spelled the end of all Imperialism in the Far East (134).

"Today, the Government are helping Japan's war by selling them the sinews of war, including oil for their air-raids, and by financial arrangements that keep the yen from collapsing...(in) the hope that if Japan is allowed...to annex North China, she may leave British Imperialism undisturbed amidst the ruins of the rest of China...The interests of the *plutocracy* would be...benefited by an *Imperialist* deal with Japan..At the same time the Government began to prepare against the possibility that the Japanese, after being discreetly assisted to lay China waste, by fire and sword, air-bomb, poison gas, famine and pestilence, might nevertheless be ungrateful enough not to respect British Imperial interests in Central China and Hongkong¹...As Sir John Simon told the House

¹As Mr. Zilliacus puts things, Japan appears wholly in the wrong, China wholly in the right. But 'politics', i.e., human nature, or indeed all Nature, is a terrible complex of 'contradictions', of 'wheels within wheels'. None is wholly in the right, none wholly in the wrong. Shiva-Rudra, Gauri-Kāli, Double-faced Janus, Jekyll-Hyde, are in every person and every nation. All concerned are to blame, some more, some less, comparatively, for the current turmoil, in east and west. Japan *has* some genuine causes for complaint against the successive governments of China, of the last 50 years, including various phases of Chiang

on 10-3-1936, it was in 1932, the very year when the Disarmament Conference met, and when the Government had made up their minds to connive at Japanese aggression, that the *Government decided to begin preparing for a great war* within ten years. Mr. Baldwin confessed, with what he himself called 'appalling frankness', in the House, on 12-11-1936, how worried the Government were over the chances of *making the British people forget* about the *Disarmament Conference* and *resign themselves* to preparing for war: Lord Londonderry, in the House of Lords, on 22-5-1935, boasted of how he had, with great difficulty, prevented the other nations from abolishing 'the artillery of the air—the bombing plane'... The following passage (occurs in) his Diary... : 'I am quite in a minority here in this *pacifist* and *sentimentalist* atmosphere, and I feel most out of place discussing these *fatuous doctrines* every day'¹ (131—137)....

Kai Shek's regime ; but Japan has latterly become *too militarist* and *imperialist*, herself, also, now, after a period of wonderful Renaissance, which won the admiration and respect of the world. 'Power intoxicates.' 'The more we have, the more we want.'

¹ *Whom the Lord loveth, He chasteneth.*

All this illustrates the splendid insight into the political workings of the human mind, which is enshrined in the animal fables of *Pancha-tantra* and *Hito-padésu*. It is all play of wit against wit ; exuberantly, buoyantly, comic ; or poignantly tragic ; according to the temperament, and, much more, the *circumstances*, of the spectator and experiencer. The diplomat of each country uses the *very same* arguments and adjectives against whoever differs from him. Lord Londonderry's book, *Ourselves and Germany*, gives, on the whole, the impression of being honestly written ; but on this particular point, i.e., ré air-bombing, he uses much of the usual casuistry and sophistry, and makes much play with the words 'practical', 'unpractical', 'theoretical', 'sentimental', etc., and tries also to 'explain away' some of his utterances and views, as having been twisted and distorted ; op. cit., pp. 47-55. It is the old, old, story, over and over again : 'What I think and say is practical ; what you think and say is unpractical'. But the consciences, the elements of the Better Mind, in him, and Mr. Eden, and any others, who supported 'police air-bombing', for the N. W. Frontier of India, and such other places, must be hurting them sadly now.

Mr. Chamberlain was quite sincere when he refused, at

In an editorial, of 26-11-1940, the *Statesman* wrote that "Greed, and the claim that increasing property and wealth carry increasing rights to dominate the lives of others, are the cause of war. The men who cause modern wars are almost all non-violent. They regard themselves as excellent citizens, they deplore wars, often they are vegetarians, and would not hurt a fly. They are only filled with an honorable ambition to get *very rich*, and to acquire the *power, over other men's lives* and labor, which they consider that increasing wealth entitles them to have, in a kind of geometrical progression. It is the greed of non-violent men that produces violence. It is *violence from the air* that *will cure the civilian of his greed*. For the first time in history, the *civilian* is well in the *war* that *his* economics have made. For the first time he will end by *willingness* to *change his economics*...Peace will not come...till Property in all the belligerent countries has had its bellyful."

It becomes necessary to write, in special circumstances, in the spirit of the surgeon lancing an abscess, for the cure of the patient.

Mr. Wells has also written in a similar spirit: "There are many excuses for the Germans, Versailles and the strangulation after 1919-1920...None the less they have been made excuses for abominable behaviour—and I am convinced that vigorous bombing...would be an entirely wholesome and chastening experience for the German 'soul' ...It has been for us. Navy-proud Englishmen have never had quite the same feeling about marine bombardments since the shelling at Scarborough, and Mr. Anthony Eden, who opposed the abolition of the bombing plane by the League of Nations, probably sees that weapon now from quite a new angle...The devastated regions of France and Belgium have not made French and Belgians into war fanatics. On the contrary, they have made them extraordinarily thoughtful about war": *The Rights of Man*, pp. 111-113. Yet, France, Belgium, Germany, if not Britain, *had* experience of similar devastation, in 1914-1918; vide Phillip Gibbs' *The Realities of War*, a book which every politician and soldier should be made to read. But, as said before, the work of the Maha-bhārata War had to be completed by the Yāḍava War; of 1914-'18, by 1939 (or rather 1938)-1941 (and who knows how much longer).

Birmingham, on 8-4-1938, to say beforehand, with reference to 'Czechoslovakia, when the Government would or would not go to war, on the ground that this would be 'a gamble, not with money, but with lives of men, women, and children of *our own race and blood*'. He was equally sincere in the House, on 24-3-1938, when he announced that he would go to war for any *British Colony* in any part of the world, and also for Fascist Portugal, Iraq, and Egypt. In other words, when it comes to the *interests of the common people*, in defending the reign of law and victims of aggression against the Fascist regimes, the Government refuse, on *pacifist* grounds, to take even the risk of collective economic action... On the other hand, when it comes to fighting for *Colonies*, the Government are ready to drown this country in blood in a single-handed war against hopeless odds.. This Government perfectly sincerely identify defence of the country with defence of the Social and Imperial *status quo*, i.e. with the defence of the *Old Order* against change. Their *identification* of the class *interests* of the *plutocracy*, with the *national interests* of the common people, is so *sincere* as to be *unconscious* (140-141).

"The Government *began preparing for a world war* in 1932, at the outset of the Disarmament Conference... The *preparations* are *inefficient*, because they too must subserve the *interest... of the war profiteers*. But they are vast world-wide preparations, ranging from air-bases in South Sea Islands to fortifying Hongkong and Singapore, South and West African naval bases, Cyprus and Malta in the Mediterranean. *Staggering sums* are being spent—three times as much as on the eve of the last world war.¹ The whole economic life of

¹Even these 'staggering sums' are 'staggered' by those spent in actual war. The British Government have officially announced that the expenditure, in the year ended 31-3-1941, was, in round figures, three thousand nine hundred million pounds, and the income, one thousand four hundred millions. The average normal annual income of the British Government, during the decade ending 1937, used to be between eight and nine hundred million pounds. So, we may take it, that of the three thousand nine hundred, at least three thousand were spent on the war, sheer, in 1941. One would like to know what the German and Italian figures, are; to say nothing of the U. S. A. billions, (of dollars), the U.S.S.R. milliards (of roubles), the Italian milliards (of lira) and the dozen small

the country is thrown out of gear. The Government also depend on the *arms race* to *keep down unemployment*—for any other way of combating it would interfere with the interests of their masters in the City and F. B. I. In this way they have *staved off trouble* for some time, but *at the cost* of accumulating *much bigger trouble* in the near future...In internal politics they are moving as fast as they dare, toward *industrial and military conscription*. In foreign politics . they are *helping Germany* to become mistress of Central Europe, *Japan* to make war on China, and *Italy* to conquer Abyssinia and Spain. This is because the Government depend on the Fascist Powers to keep the spirit of reaction alive in the world, and *to instil the fear of death in the hearts of the British people*...Mr. Duff Cooper said, a couple of years ago, that it was the duty of all in authority to *frighten the people* of this country out of their wits.¹ For only in that atmosphere can

Powers' tens of millions, and the Chino-Japanese hundreds of millions, (of other coins).

¹It has been said above, that, in India, the provincial Governors and local officials have begun (in the third week of March, 1941) to speak of the danger of the bombing of Indian towns. There *may* be the danger. The conflagration is obviously showing no signs yet of contracting; instead, many, of spreading. *But—what can India do?* The Government is already *taking* all the men and materials it wants from the country. That immensely major portion of it which is with the Congress, is only *withholding* its *moral support*. The world knows that India is one of the poorest of countries now, where, formerly, it was one of the richest. It has not the money, the scientific skill, the vast factories, of the U. S. A., 'to lend in return for leases'. It has been prevented, by 'circumstances', from developing this wealth, skill, factorial industry, and 'freedom and power to lend and lease'. It *gives* the little it has on *demand*. What it *is* rich in, is (cheap and hungry) human life. Men, it could give in millions. But they have been studiously kept untrained. Year after year...India's public men and 'Legislators' (*pseudo*, because they have *no real power* to make laws as they think proper)—the present writer among them, as he was a Member of the Central Legislative Assembly, from 1935 to 1938, and then resigned—have been pleading with the Government to take the well-known first step, in making a country capable of self-defence, of training

Toryism in this country survive....How much in this policy is deliberate deceit, how much unconscious self-deception, it is difficult to say (143-145).

all the able-bodied, in common, simple, military drills and exercises, and creating a 'territorial militia', or 'civic guard', or 'volunteer corps'; the name does not matter. It would be very easy to secure *at least* as many such trained men, as Russia is said to possess, i.e., 15 to 20 millions, in India, which has more than twice the population of Russia. But the Government have always evaded and avoided, under the flimsiest pretexts; such as (1) the lack, in sufficient numbers, of the right quality of men (!)—what a truth and what a compliment to the Indian soldier (!), after experience of his quality, in actual war, in *three* continents, Asia, Europe, Africa; including the present; further proved to be most flimsy pretext, by the fact, which General Molesworth announced by broadcast from New Delhi, in March 1941, that *half a million* Indian soldiers had *now*, under stress of war-conditions, been actually trained up and added to the Indian army in the last few months; or (2) want of money (!), when 'staggering sums' were being spent, all the while, on preparation for this war, in Britain; and when Indian 'legislators', the present writer among them, in 1937, pointed out ways and means of doing this *training* work very inexpensively, by putting it on a *pañchāyāt* basis, and making it largely self-supporting. Lord Kitchener was able to train up *millions* of office clerks, tradesmen, and farmers of Britain, within *three months*, for the previous War; but the Indian is not trainable (!) The reason for the avoidance of such territorial militia, etc., is plain; the creation of such a vast potential army, while pre-eminently in keeping with a genuine British-Indian *Commonwealth*, is *not* in keeping with India's *Dependency* in a British *Empire*.

Therefore, in accord with the Law of Nature's Balancings and Compensations, which Emerson was able to discern and describe freshly for the west, the untrained and 'subjected' Indian resists the fear of 'sudden death', from bombs etc., with the weapon of helpless Fatalism; while the British and other peoples, diligently trained and intensively organised for all kinds of trade-and-war work, are "frightened out of their wits", as was recommended by Mr. Duff-Cooper, now a Cabinet Minister, and are stampeded into 'heroic' war with their neighbouring peoples. U. S. A. too has now begun to publicly..

"Rather than let Capitalism go in order to save civilisation, they are preparing to smash civilisation in order to die hard in futile defence of Capitalism¹...They are doing only what governing classes have always done..wrecking civilisation rather than sacrifice their class power and privileges....But the *Government are utterly dependent on organised labour*...The power of the government to continue their Rake's Progress is rooted in *their hold on the minds of the workers*...For this reason, the Government have paid as meticulous attention to *fooling the workers* as their predecessors did in the Great War...This...fooling...has proceeded along four main lines.. (1) *Misrepresentation* (of political happenings)...(2) *They plead good intentions*. Love of peace is the reason why they give the Fascist Powers a free hand to make war. This line has considerable success. A great many good souls keep on upbraiding the Government for their 'weakness', 'vacillation', 'pacifism', etc. This suits the Government admirably, for it enables them to pose as peace lovers and to accuse their opponents of war-mongering... (3) The Government's third line is, that Labor's demands, for collective action to stand by the Covenant and victims of aggression, would mean war, and that their (the Government's) policy would keep us out of the war...The Opposition do not..retort...(that) a collective security policy involves only a small risk of war,...with most of the world on our side,...whereas the Government's policy contemplates.. actually going to war, alone, against impossible odds, and

entertain serious apprehensions for her own interests—of various kinds—from Japan on the Pacific side and Hitler on the Atlantic. Though the possibility of either of the two actually invading U. S. A. is very remote, indeed; yet, who knows, "Appetites do grow with what they feed upon", "Power intoxicates much more than alcohol"; they too might wish to own 'Empires on which the sun never sets'; though, then, Providence will have to set them by the ears, for 'balance' and 'compensation'!

¹ Let it be repeated here, that the ancient Indian Scheme is *not against capital*, but only against capital-ism; *not against ploutos* (wealth), but only against pluto-crazy (*kratein*, rule). It is against *all isms* and *all cracies*, except Human-ism and Aristo-Demo-Homo-crazy, 'the rule of the *best men*'; for finding and choosing whom, it prescribes rules.

for the hopeless cause of Imperialism...This war the Government cannot indefinitely prevent and have practically no chance of winning.¹ Even if any Opposition speaker does say this, he is not taken seriously, because the *Labour Party have no policy on the subject*, and the Tories are quite confident that Labour will support them in fighting for Imperialism. (4) For to the fourth line of Tory argument, official Labor has hitherto failed to produce any answer. That argument is the plea for '*national unity in defence of democracy*'. This is the great and *baneful falsehood* with which the Government are unmercifully fooling Labour and the common people generally. What they really mean is national unity by destroying democracy by the imposition of military and industrial conscription, and by dufting into a suicidal war over the colonies" (157-161).

Mr. Zilliacus may have exaggerated a little, here and there; may have been one-sided, and not shown what there was to show on the other side; but he is on the whole convincing; and he has fully justified his claim (op. cit., p. 27) that he has "quoted first-hand authorities". Few books that the present writer has come across are so illuminative of the whole tangle as his. One feels inclined to go on quoting from him 'by the yard'. But the immediate purpose of the above extracts is to illustrate the principle that without an Equitable Order *within* each Society or Community or Nation or People—use whichever name pleases you most—there will never be an Equitable World Order and World Peace. As explained before, this is the significance of the Indian idea of *Varṇa-vyava-sthā*, the ad-just-ing, sta-bilising e-stab-lish-ing, of equitable relations between the (four main and numerous subordinate) Vocational Classes; which are necessarily present in each community at all civilised; and are to be found, in seed, even in the un-civilised. But the Indian

¹ While most of Mr. Zilliacus' forecasts have come true, this is likely to be falsified, because the U.S.A. seems to have come to Britain's aid whole-heartedly now, since March 1941; after having helped her half-heartedly all along. Britain is now quite likely to win the war, as in the previous Great War; unless the U.S.A. exacts too heavy a price from Britain, in the shape of 'leases' etc., and reduces her to the position of a satellite, scarcely better than India's Dependency-ship; which, however, is not likely.

thought goes further. It 'organises' not only the *Social* life thus, by *Varna-vyava-sihā*; but also the *Individual* life, by *Āshrama-vyava-sihā*, the four stages or periods of each life. All this has been expounded in other works by the present writer. Perhaps, something more may be said; here also, in App. C.¹

In the last pages of his book, Mr. Zilliacus suggests "the main heads of a constructive policy", which "the Opposition should advocate"; briefly, (1) form a genuine, broad-viewed, far-sighted Government, that would understand and

¹ "States and nations don't exist as such. There are only people. Sets of people living in certain areas, having certain allegiances. Nations don't change their national policies, unless and until people change their private policies. All governments, even Hitler's, even Stalin's, even Mussolini's, are representative". (The author means, presumably, that they are made possible, by the *acquiescence*, when not by the direct vote, of the vast majority of the people; in whatever way the acquiescence may be secured, by bullying, terrorising, cajoling, deceiving with false promises, false propaganda, taking advantage of the people's apathy or excessive pre-occupation with the hard work of winning the daily bread). "Today's national behaviour—a large scale projection of today's individual behaviour...projection of the individual's secret wishes and intentions. For we should all like to behave a good deal worse than our conscience and respect for public opinion allow. One of the great attractions of patriotism—it fulfils our worst wishes", (the 'dark, mysterious forces of the Unconscious', of the Freudians—which are not mysterious at all, but glaringly patent in human life). "In the person of our nation, we are able, vicariously, to bully and cheat... with a feeling that we're profoundly virtuous. Sweet and decorous to murder, lie, torture, for the sake of the fatherland", (and loot and plunder, especially)...Peace propaganda must be a set of instructions in the art of modifying character". Aldous Huxley, *Stories, Essays*, etc., Everyman's Lib., pp. 163-164). To the last sentence, the important addition is needed, viz., 'and the art of modifying character i.e., Universal Right Education, cannot be effectively practised, except in the Setting of a Rational Social Organisation'; (see the present writer's *The Science of Social Organisation*, and *The Science of the Emotions*).

promote "the interests of "the common people" ; (2) in home affairs, adopt certain specified measures ; (3) "in 'Imperial policy'...take *immediate* steps to *come to terms* with the Congress movement in *India*, on the basis of recognising *India's right* to self-determination and to frame her own or revise the existing Constitution in a Constituent Assembly, in return for Congress pledging themselves to bring a free India into an association for mutual defence and economic and political co-operation based on the principles of the League Covenant. ...*Colonies* fit for immediate self-government should be given it ; the rest, placed under *an advanced form* of the mandates system...to educate and train them for self-government as rapidly as possible". (The fourth deals with the Spanish Republic, which the march of events has thrown out of date now). Then follow specific suggestions—all eminently sane, reasonable, worthy of careful consideration—for international linking up and "Co-operation...in the whole great adventure of building up a New World Order....Civilisation could survive only if war was outlawed by ending international anarchy, by erecting a system of World Government based on Democracy, *Social Justice*, and Racial Equality...A Declaration" (of the Rights and Duties of Man)...*"would be the World's Charter of Democracy, Freedom, and Peace...It would be 'put over,' (in all countries), by every device of modern publicity—press, pulpit, parliament, platform, radio, cinema, television, in all languages"* ; devices which are now being prostituted, in *every country*, to the *basest* purposes. So would "the citizens of the associated countries grow in stature and in unity as they feel that their nations stand together in a vast Community, pledged to a Great Ideal, nothing less than leading Mankind, out of the Shadow of Death, into a World of Peace, Order, and Human *Brotherhood*, that today seems a beautiful dream, but is, notwithstanding, the Only Practical Goal,...because it is a *stark necessity*."¹

¹Thus is the first object of the Theosophical Society, founded sixty-six years ago, in 1875, being justified in the field of 'practical politics' by 'practical politicians' ; not mere sentimentalists. Mr. Zilliacus is probably not a member of the Theosophical Society, but no member could put the case

Don't desire Victory ; Desire Peace.

The nett result, of all these considerations, is, over and over again, that if both the belligerents go on insisting on 'Victory before talk of Peace'—neither will ever be real victor, as very many thoughtful writers have been saying. To quote Mr. Zilliacus again: "Mr. Chamberlain has repeatedly declared that there will be no victors in the next war. Lord (then Mr.) Baldwin stated, at Bewdley, on April 10, 1936, 'I have often uttered the truism that the next war will be the end of civilisation in Europe...When that war comes to an end, the raging peoples of every country, torn with passion, suffering, horror, would wipe out every Government in Europe ; and you would have a state of anarchy from end to end of it as man's protest against *wickedness in high places*'..." (p. 193). Mr. Chamberlain, and his predecessor in Premiership, Mr. Baldwin, both knew it ; the highest placed statesmen of the other nations knew it ; but, doom-driven, they all prepared for the war, and plunged their countries into it. "There is a Providence that shapes our ends", and Destiny makes puppets of us all. The War *had* to be ; in order to produce that change in the Mass-Mind of the Human Race which Mr. Baldwin apprehended, and, without which, "wickedness" will not be deposed from its "high places". But God, in His Mercy, continues to give to the rulers of men, in the high places, chance after chance. Through all the happening circumstances, He calls to them : MAKE PEACE, even now. It is not yet too late. Repent Soften your hearts. Show mercy, even now, to the tortured peoples of the earth ; and you will, even now, receive the Mercy of God which you have long forfeited. An overwhelming victory, to any belligerent, will be fraught with grave danger to all Mankind ; danger from Triumph-maddened despotic Power, in the present conditions. Therefore it will not be permitted by the Mystery. That Fate, though mysterious, yet works by plain psychological laws. It converts 'the clond no bigger than a man's hand' into the roaring typhoon that thrusts and forces, resistlessly, ever so many brave-looking Ships of State, down, down, into the yawning jaws of the ocean's deeps. The proof is plainly

for "the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity" more effectively, or drive it home more closely. We have seen before, that Mr. W. B. Curry uses similar language in *The Case for Federal Union* (pp. 71-72, *supra*).

set there, before our eyes. Very carefully, with cunning and caution infinite, was the Treaty of Versailles drawn up, to make perpetual 'balances of power,' and 'buffer-states' and 'encirclements.' Yet all the care and caution and cunning have been brought to nought—by *psychological laws and facts, viz., uncontrolled, unregulated, excessive greeds, lusts, arrogances, jealousies, hates, distrusts, betrayals, lies, selfishnesses*; said to be 'dark and mysterious forces of the Unconscious', yet things which are within the consciousness of everyone's everyday experience.

Therefore, this time, with roar of fire and thunder, through the rain of bombs from the skies, and the pillars of fire that spring up in response, from the blasted towns of sinning men, the Mystery says insistently: MAKE PEACE OR PERISH, all of you. UNITE OR PERISH; in every possible sense. MAKE PEACE, *within* each mind, as well as *without*, between all bodies; *within* each nation, between all sections and vocations, as well as *without*, between all nations and all races. You, Great Britain and Great Germany; You, Great Japan and Great China; You, Great France and Great Italy; You, Great U.S.A. and Great Russia—MAKE PEACE between yourselves, and between *Britain and India*, and thence, all over the Earth.

CHAPTER VIII

The Sordid Hindu-Muslim Squabbles.

Side by side with the vast wars in east and west, part of the general World Disorder, seeming comparatively mean and sordid, yet very important in implications and consequences, is the pentangular struggle proceeding in India ; between (1) the British Government ; (2) the Congress representing the widest and most general interests of the Indian People as a whole ; (3) the Hindu Maha Sabha and similar collateral or allied bodies representing what are supposed to be peculiar Hindu interests ; (4) the Muslim League and other associations representing similarly imagined special Muslim interests ; and (5) the Ruling Chiefs of the Indian States.

If the New World Order were *thought* out, with open mind and eyes, between the great world-rulers ; instead of the Old World Dis-order being *fought* out, as is being done, blindly ; then the Universal Peace which would descend upon earth, as reviving rain upon drought-dried vegetation, would, of course, extinguish the smouldering fires of the struggle going on in India also. On the other hand, if Hindus and Muslims could *Make Peace* and come to a reasonable agreement *among themselves*, and with the Congress, over the *tentative* Outlines of a Constitution for India, which would satisfy all just interests, which would find a suitable work for every person and a suitable person for every work, as far as humanly possible ; they would, without fail, induce the British Government to meet their demand, and create a genuine British-Indian Commonwealth, which would, by sheer force of high Moral Example, compel all the other Nations, Germany and Italy included, to fall into line, for the expansion of that British-Indian Commonwealth into a World Commonwealth.

Let us quote again, here, the very important utterance of Herr Hitler, in Munich, on 9.11.1939, which has been quoted before, at p.16 :

"If Britain started granting her own Empire full liberty, by restoring the freedom of India, we should have bowed before her."

It seems, to *some* human beings at least, that the Mystery has willed that Britain shall 'win' the war, *not* by any overwhelming martial victory, but by the world-wide uprush of a Great Will-to-Peace, which will occur only *when* Britain has created a genuine and sincere British-Indian Commonwealth.

To intellectually persuade and morally compel Britain to do so, the Indian National *Congress* must produce a rational all-reconciling draft of the Indian Constitution. The duty and responsibility for doing this, rests primarily upon the Congress.

To lead on to the detailed consideration of this duty, incumbent upon the Congress, we have to deal with the disagreements between the Hindus and the Muslims; which disagreements are made the excuse, by the British Government, for the withholding of Dominion Status.

Utter Artificiality of Causes of Disagreement.

Fundamentally, the disagreements are utterly artificial, in the deepest sense. The word 'Hindu' or the word 'Muslim' is not branded by Nature, on any brow; any more than is the word 'Briton' or 'German' or 'French' or 'Italian'. But 'Human Being'—this fact is stamped by Nature on every human face, indelibly, unmistakeably. The World-process, however, *means*, fall into, first and then ascent out of, such radical errors and artificialities, viz., of human beings identifying themselves, exclusively, with particular labels, signboards, inessential names, forms, conventions, customs, practices, of all sorts. These form the real 'fetters' of the mind, as Buddha and other Teachers have called them. These bring about the loss of *mental* 'Freedom' first, and of all other 'freedoms' afterwards. Hence the frantic efforts of all Governments, electioneers, profiteers, to hypnotise the public mind by false propaganda. Out of these arbitrary and stubborn identifications, 'heart-knots', 'mental complexes', arise occasions for complaint against one another. These occasions are again artificially aggravated and utilised by third parties; professional priests to whom 'religion' has become a trade; religio-political self-seeking leaders; administrators, lawyers, capitalists, armament-makers, militarists, imperialists; in short, all those who profit by fomenting quarrels between others.

The only Radical Remedy for all such conflicts, disorders, Radical Errors, (or, at least, the best and most effective Remedy possible, since abolition of *all* Hate, Discord, Conflict, is not possible), is a combination of All-Embracing World Order and World Religion.

The Bye-product of the Disputes, viz., the Cry for a Separate Pakistan.

In the case of the sordid Hindu-Muslim disputes, the latest bye-product thereof is that some leaders of the Muslim League are insistently demanding that India should be cut up into a Pakistan or 'non-Hindu Hindu-stan,' and a 'Hindu Hindu-stan'; each to consist of several blocks, according to the numerical predominance of Muslims or Hindus in each block; but with a 'democratic' constitution. In view of the fact that Hindu and Muslim homes are intermingled all over the country, especially in the larger towns; and that the demand is entirely against the spirit of the times, which points unmistakably towards 'federation,' 'co-operation,' 'greater and greater union,' rather than 'separation'; serious differences of opinion have arisen, over the proposal, within the Muslim League itself. Some important Muslim leaders, of Sind, Punjab, Bengal, who are members of the Muslim League, have declared themselves positively against it; notably, Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan, at present Prime Minister of the Punjab. Some have even resigned from the Muslim League. Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan repeated his condemnation of the Pakistan Scheme strongly on 1.2.1941, at a public gathering held in celebration of the annual Hindu festival of *Vasanta Panchami*, which marks the first beginnings of Spring after the severities of Winter.

The only thing that can be said for the Pakistan demand is that it may act as a stimulus, to the Muslims generally, and the Hindus specially, to search their hearts, their heads, their consciences, confess their sins to themselves and to the public, and rid themselves of the *ir*-religious ways into which both have fallen, and which are causing all these troubles. Even so, in a far more acute and painful manner, is the ghastly war, now raging in east and west, a stimulus to intense head-and-heart-searching for a New Way of Life. The Only Way, in both cases, is to establish a New World Order and create a Better World, on the solid foundation of a truly Spiritual World Religion, which will make adequate provision for *Material* as well as *Spiritual* Bread for all.

The Hindus more to blame.

The present writer has felt, and has publicly said, for many years, that the Hindus are more particularly to blame. Born in a 'Hindu' family, he continues to allow himself to be regarded as a 'Hindu.' Though he regards himself as only a 'human being'; and does not believe that there is any value

now left in wearing or bearing any denominational labels and signs on mind or body ; yet he sees no particular advantage in changing the label which has come to him by his birth ; and sees greater possibility, of influencing the Hindus towards regeneration, by retaining their label, than if he changed it. In these circumstances, he unhesitatingly says that the Hindus, or rather the Hindu 'leaders', are much more to blame for these dissensions of Hindu and Muslim, than the Muslims or Muslim leaders, or any third party.

If the Hindu leaders understood the true nature of their Dharma, the Varṇ-āshrama-Dharma, and taught their followers accordingly, all these conflicts would disappear at once.¹ That Dharma is a mould into which all human beings, of any and every race and nation, any and every creed, can be poured, according to their vocational aptitude and temperament, and fitted, each one, into his and her appropriate niche in a systematic Social Organisation, which is capable of adoption everywhere, *without* the disturbance of any raciality or nationality or creedal belief. The leaders of the Hindu Maha Sabha, instead of intensifying the mutual dislike, by challenging and antagonising the Muslim League, should concentrate on re-forming, re-generating, their own Hinduism and Hindu Community ; clearing it from its superstitions, selfishnesses, exclusivenesses, 'caste'-corruptions and 'caste'-tyrannies—which are daily driving hundreds into other folds. They should do so, not by mere emotional exhortations to unite against a common adversary, which only make matters worse in many ways ; but by rational systematic teaching of the fundamental principles underlying the Varṇ-āshrama-Dharma ; and showing that, by those principles, all who are regarded now as enemies, would be reconciled ; that Muslims, Christians, Shias, Sunnis, Roman Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Parsis, Buddhists, etc., could all be welcomed, *within* it, in the same way as Shaivas, Shākṭas, Vaiṣṇavas, Sikhs, and hundreds of other 'sects', were and are welcomed and included *within* it, while *keeping intact* their special religious creeds and practices.

¹ Besides the works, and scores of articles, on the subject, which he has written in English and Hindi, the present writer has compiled a work in Samskr̥t, *Mānava-Dharma-Sāra*, for the special use of Pandits, in which he has quoted some 500 texts verbatim, from the old books.

The Leaders of the Hindu Maha Sabha.

The present President of the Hindu Maha Sabha, Shri V. D. Savarkar, has all the great qualities of Jawaharlal Nehru, and as fine a record of public-spirited self-sacrifice and suffering. But, unfortunately, he seems not to have Jawaharlal's breadth of outlook, which declines to cling too closely to the 'label' Hindu, and thinks much more of Humanism, while remaining within 'Hinduism'. He fully recognises the present corruption of the 'caste'-system; through the shifting of it from the basis of 'spontaneous variation' or 'mutation' and vocational temperament and aptitude, and the *actual bread-winning occupation*, (any one of four main kinds), to the basis of 'crass and rigid heredity'. In his own private life, he does not observe any rules of 'orthodoxy'. His very courageous lieutenant, born fighter, and vice-president of the Hindu Maha Sabha, Dr. Moonje, is also equally 'unorthodox'. The current year's (1941) Working President, Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerji, (ex-Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University, and M. L. A., Bengal), appointed as such, because of Shri V. D. Savarkar's break-down of health, owing to overwork—Dr. S. P. Mukerji also is not 'orthodox'. But, for some reason or other, they, and the other important leaders of the Sabha, most of whom are equally 'unorthodox', have, so far, not been publicly preaching, so assiduously as it ought to be preached, from the platform of the Hindu Maha Sabha, the urgent necessity of *reforming* the Hindu 'Social Organisation', and shifting it back to its original and true psychologically scientific basis. No doubt, they have indicated, in their public speeches, now and then, the present *corruptness* of the so-called 'Caste-System', and the need for reform. But they have not done so with the indispensable persistence, vigour, and clear statement of *the lines* on which *reform* should be made, (so as to preserve the Mould of the Organisation by four *vocational classes*, as contra-distinguished from *hereditary castes*). If they did so, all these communal conflicts would abate at once. The grievous blunder of 'separatism' of 'castes', with their mutual untouchabilities, is leading to the 'separatism' of Pākistān (which means 'the land of the *pure*') from what the Muslims have the right to call 'Nā-pāk-istān' ('the land of the *impure*', the 'untouchables').

This 'separatist caste-ism' is, in nature, the same as the appalling blunder of 'separatist nationalism', which has

hurled Europe and China-Japan into the Inferno of ghastly war. Some of us have repeatedly urged upon the Hindu Maha Sabha leaders; publicly through the dailies and pamphlets and written books, privately by correspondence and in oral conversations, this urgent need of diligent re-form *within* Hinduism; but without much effect so far. It may be that considerations of 'expediency', of not antagonising the 'orthodox' Hindus, are weighing with them. But such considerations are false and mischievous. Moses, Buddha, Christ, Muhammad, could not have done the work they did, if they had yielded to such false considerations; which, indeed, argue lack of faith in their own views, on the part of the leaders. It needs greater moral courage to fight against *internal* corruptions than to fight against *external* aggressions. It is necessary, no doubt, on special occasions, to see the moles in others' eyes, in order to cure them, if possible; but it is always more necessary to see and cure the beams in our own, also.

The Muslims and the Christians too have much need to reform their religions. As currently practised, many evils are to be found in them too; but they are perhaps fewer and less serious than those in Hinduism.

Important Hindu and Muslim Associations, other than the Muslim League and the Hindu Maha Sabha.

It should be borne in mind here, that the Muslim League and the Hindu Maha Sabha are the only bodies, (but they are influential), which are keeping the two communities apart in spirit; and that, in politics, the Muslim League is for out-and-out separatism, while the Hindu Maha Sabha is utterly against this political separatism; though, in politics also, the *objective* of both is the same, viz., (the substance of) 'Independence'. There are many other bodies, important, in their own ways, of Muslims as well as Hindus, which, while they emphasise their separate creeds, are insistent upon keeping the whole country one, politically; and these bodies are growing in strength and influence. Of course, it is well-known that Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, a very learned Muslim divine, is the present President of the Indian National Congress. He was imprisoned by the U. P. Government, on 3. 1. 1941.

The following extract from a very important and truly statesman-like resolution, adopted by the All India Azad

Muslim Conference, held at Delhi, on 30th April, 1940, against the Pakistan Scheme, must be reproduced here :—

"This Conference of representatives of the Indian Muslims, who desire to secure the fullest freedom for their country, consisting of delegates and representatives from all provinces, after having given its fullest and most careful consideration to all the vital questions affecting the interests of the Muslim community, and the country as a whole, declares the following :—

"*India*, with its geographical and political boundaries is *an indivisible whole*, and as such, it is the common homeland of all the citizens, irrespective of race or religion, who are joint owners of its resources.

"*All nooks and corners* of the country *contain* the hearths and *homes* of the *Muslims*, and the cherished historic monuments of their religion and culture, which are dearer to them than their lives.

"From the national point of view, every Muslim is an Indian. The common rights of all the inhabitants of the country and their responsibilities in every walk of life and in every sphere of activity *are the same*.

"*The Indian Muslim*, by virtue of these rights and responsibilities, is unquestionably an *Indian national*; and in every part of the country, he is entitled to equal privileges with all other Indian nationals, in every sphere of governmental, economic, and other national activities. For that very reason, Muslims owe equal responsibility with other Indians, for striving and making sacrifices to achieve the country's Independence.

"This is a self-evident proposition, the truth of which no right-thinking Muslim will question.

"This Conference declares unequivocally, and with all the emphasis at its command, that *the goal of Indian Muslims is complete independence*, along with the protection of their religious and communal rights, and they are anxious to attain this goal as early as possible.

"Inspired by this aim, they have in the past made great sacrifices".

Maulana Mohammad Mian, Secretary of the U. P. Jamiat-ul-Ulema, in the course of a public speech at Gorakhpur, on 17-12-1940, said that "the Jamiat-ul-Ulema was not affiliated to the Congress, but co-operated with the Congress, the only other organisation which was striving for Indian liberty; so far as the independence of the Motherland was concerned, the

Jamiat-ul-Ulema was at one with the Congress; it was useless to say that the Hindus had subjected them to oppression; the scheme of *dividing the country* into two parts", (a Muslim Pakistan and a Hindu Hindustan), "which has been devised by the Muslim League to put an end to the so-called oppression, would only *aggravate* the trouble; *the only remedy to end these troubles was to evolve a common constitution acceptable to both communities*; the question before the country was not...how many Collectors or Commissioners were going to be Indians, but how we could remove the poverty and hunger of the 75 p.c. of Indians who were starving. Its only solution was complete independence—a *new order pledged to the removal of poverty*".

The italicised words are very wise words; they are in entire accord with, and give strong support to, the plea put forward here. The Jamiat-ul-Ulemā is undisputedly the most important association of learned Muslim divines in India. Its central head-quarters are in Delhi. It has always worked side by side with the Congress in the political struggle. Its president, secretary, and other office-bearers have often braved the prison, together with Congressmen, in the past.

More recently, on 1-1-1941, "In reply to the speech of Mr. Jinnah at Karachi, Syed Habibur Rahman, President, All-Bengal Krishak Praja Samiti, has issued the following statement:—

"*India shall be governed*, not by a majority or minority rule, but by reliable ideal *Hindu-Muslim patriots*, who shall enjoy the confidence not only of Muslims but also of Hindus and other Indian communities. In other words, it shall be the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Mr. Jinnah is awfully mistaken if he thinks that all Indian Nationalist Muslims hailing from the Congress, the Majlis-i-Ahrar, the Bengal Krishak Praja Party, the Jamiat-ul-Ulema, the Jamiat-ul-Momin, etc., are less Muslim-minded and less patriotic than Mr. Jinnah, in any way, for their love to their own Muslim community.

"The Muslim *Leaguers* have *not* yet undergone any suffering and *sacrifice* for securing the country's goal, nor can they boast of any quota or contribution for the country's struggle. But Muslim *League leaders* have been till now *building* their fortunes upon the suffering, *sacrifice*, and patriotism of *other* Nationalist Indians."

"This is high time for Indian Muslim Nationalists, natural

leaders of the Indian Muslims, to come to the forefront, to enter into a political pact with Indian Hindu Nationalists, and end or mend Mr. Jinnah and his Muslim League.. ”

The statement goes on to make some strong personal remarks, which need not be repeated here.

It should be carefully borne in mind, by all concerned, in connection with the Hindu-Muslim problem of India, that there is probably *not a single* Indian Musalman, today, who is not, either himself a direct convert from Hinduism to Islam, or descended from near or distant ancestors who were Hindus and were converted to Islam; that Hindus have converted themselves into Muslims, *mostly* because of the *tyrannies* of ‘hereditary caste’; and that 1400 years ago, when Islam had not been born yet, all the countries that are now known as Baluchistan, Afghanistan, Turkistan, etc., were Hindu or Buddhist. The Hindu Maha Sabha, has, therefore, no more right to talk of Hindu Raj, than the Muslim League has to talk of Muslim Raj. Indian Hindu and Indian Musalman both are equally children of Mother India, and have equal ‘human’ rights in and ‘human’ duties to her, and in respect of each other.

Still more recent is the following, published in *The Hindustan Times*, 17-2-1941 :—

“Two anti-Pakistan meetings were held at Nagpur last night, one addressed by Maulana Maqbul Huq (a Congressman from Punjab) under the auspices of the Nagpur Congress Committee, and the other by Maulana Asaf Bihari, General Secretary, All-India Momin Conference, in Mominpura, which is considered as a stronghold of the Muslim League. Maulana Maqbul Huq said that Pakistan supported the policy of *divide and rule* adopted by Britishers. The Majlis-i-Ahrar, the All India Shia Conference, the All-India Momin Conference and the Proja Parishad in Bengal, and the Congress Muslims, opposed that scheme. If Muslims could demand *Pakistan*, Sikhs might as well demand a *Sikhistan*, Mahars a *Maharistan*, Jains a *Jainistan*, and thus the whole of India would be divided into small ‘stans’, which would help to perpetuate the policy of *divide and rule* of the British Government, and India would never become free.

“M. Asaf Bihari, General Secretary of the All-India Momin Conference, said that Momins in India numbered four and a half crores, and were a separate entity from the Muslim League. They would strive to assert their rights in proportion to their population.”

Such meetings and resolutions of the representatives of large and important sections of the Muslims of India are fairly frequent. The Shias, referred to in the above, number a fourth, or even a third, of the total Muslim population of India. Their most important centre, perhaps, is Lucknow; where, within the last three years, there have been very serious 'communal riots' between them and the Sunnis. The Momins, (or Ansars, as also they call themselves), may not be quite four and a half crores, but they too number a fourth to a third of the Indian Muslims. The Ahrār Muslim organisation, which has its principal seat in the Punjab, began its Satyāgraha almost before the Congress started it this time. The papers reported that its tenth 'dictator,' in succession, was imprisoned in March 1941. It has been said before, that by the end of the first week of March, 1941, five thousand persons had been put in prison, including thirty-two Ministers. In the subsequent three weeks, the number has gone up to about 12000, in the U. P. alone. Figures for the rest of India are not yet available. They probably amount to as much. A thousand, out of the total, may safely be regarded as the number of the Muslims, including *women*, learned Maulavis, land-holders, and wealthy businessmen, as well as persons of the middle and poorer classes.

Reasons for the comparative smallness of these numbers are these. The 'auto-nomous' Governors of the different Provinces are experimenting with different policies, for different reasons. In some provinces they are *not* arresting Satyagrahis. In Southern India, especially in Andhra, hundreds of Satyagrahis are reported to be marching from village to village, proclaiming their views, without being arrested. In Bengal also, where the Muslim population is greater than the Hindu, by the census, the policy of the Local Government seems to be not to arrest Satyagrahis except here and there. The Sindh province, which also has a larger Muslim population, has not been allowed by the Congress to participate in the struggle. In the N. W. Frontier Province too, with a Muslim majority population, the ex-Minister, Dr. Khan, and his brother Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, (the 'Frontier Gandhi', as he is affectionately called by the people), and their Congress colleagues have been going about preaching Satyagraha, but have not been molested by the Government¹.

¹As the proofs of these pages are being corrected, the dailies, d/ 21 and 22-4-1941, report the following events :

A Bird's-eye View of 60 years of Indian History.

From 1857 to 1877 ; from the fall of the Mughal Empire at Delhi and the loss of the Sepoy War for Independence, to the first British Imperial Coronation Darbar at Delhi ; this may be said to form a distinct period in recent Indian history.

(1) A meeting of *Indian Christians* at, Madura, on 19-4-1941, "adopted a resolution calling upon the Christians all over the country for openly espousing the cause of unity and freedom. It also resolved that *Indian Christians can never admit Pakistan* in any shape or form, as that will eventually expose the lesser minorities to the tender mercies of majorities in their respective communal rule. The meeting also decided to support any organisation whose policy was to frustrate the Pakistan scheme": (*H. Times*).

(2) An important statement has been issued by the Most Rev. Dr. Foss Westcott, Metropolitan of India (Calcutta). In it he says, "While recognising that, under the present form of Government, the declaration of war was legitimate, I, with many others, regret that it was not found possible in some way to *consult India*. It is to my own fellow-countrymen living in India that I make my special appeal. We seem to have reached a stage when the long connection between Britain and India is in danger of being dissolved in a flood of mutual recrimination and misunderstanding. Surely we as the citizens of a free country.. recognise the right of India to determine her own future position. We can still...by frankness, friendliness,...confidence, convince India that there is much to be gained on both sides by a continuance of close association between our respective countries as *equal partners* in a great *Common-wealth of Nations*...To promote goodwill and mutual understanding between every class of people in India is the truest service we can render to the country... The *only basis of co-operation* is in the fact that.. we are all children of the *One God* and Father, who has committed to all, some part of the wisdom and strength which are needed for the fulfilment of His creative purpose. That Divine guidance is essential when every scientific discovery is being diverted to purposes of mutual destruction : (*H. Times*).

(3) "Elaborate arrangements are being made at Kumbakonam in connection with the Anti-Separation Conference which has been convened by the nationalistic-minded Muslims of South India, to record their protest against the Pakistan scheme of the Muslim League": (*H. Times*).

From 1877-'8 to 1917-'8 may be regarded as another such period ; marked by the growing permeation of Indian life by the activities of the British administration ; marked also by the work of the Arya Samaj, the Mohomedan Anglo-Oriental College of Aligarh, the Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College of Lahore, the Theosophical Society, and the Indian National Congress, by the foundation of the Central Hindu College at Benares and its growth into the Benares Hindu University, the growth of the M. A. O. College into the Aligarh Muslim University, the formation of the Muslim League, and then of the Hindu Maha Sabha, and by the public introduction of the principle of *separate electorates* and *communal proportions* in elective bodies and the public services. This last is the *most prolific* source of manifold *separatist mischief*. It has inevitably infected with the virus of the communalist spirit,

(+) AS regards the idea of a great *Common-wealth of Nations*, it has been repeatedly said in this book, that a *genuine British-Indian Common-wealth* is the best and surest beginning and foundation of it. *H. Times*, 21-4-1941, publishes an article, "Britain and the New Order", by Leonard Woolf, in which the author shows that the Ottawa policy of "Economic Imperialism", of creating "a self-sufficient empire", "on the principle—we (British) first, the other white units of the empire second, the foreigner nowhere within the ring-fence of the British empire";—the author shows that this policy failed miserably ; and he ends the article thus: "If we win this war,...(and) rise above our own stupidity... Joseph Chamberlain's (one time) dream (which he threw overboard later) might come true, of a *beneficent British Empire dissolving*, without disintegration, *into a wider World-Order*". The argument of this book is that a Rational Scheme of a New World Order should be put forward at once, *now*, (without waiting for the winning of the War by any body), by the leading Scientists of all Nations, or by either or both of the belligerents ; and that *that would* automatically stop the war also. (5) "200 delegates of 100 trade union co-operative and political bodies (at Glasgow, on 21-4-1941) endorsed the principle of independence for India, at a Conference organised by the India League,...and proclaimed the unity of the *Scottish People* with the *People of India* in their struggle for political and social freedom" ; (*Leader*, 22-4-1941). All honor to them for thinking of justice to India, amidst their own tribulations from German air-raids.

all the departments of the Public Services, Judiciary included ; and made all unreliable, to the Public Mind, generally speaking, as regards impartiality between citizen and citizen, in every affair or case in which persons of the two different creeds are involved, and the office-bearer belongs to one of the two. It has now culminated in the cry for a *separate* Pākistan. It was given birth to, by Viceroy Minto and Secretary of State for India John Morley ('honest John', as he was called in England). The late Maulana Mohamed Ali, frank, outspoken, brave fighter, in his Presidential address at the Coconada Congress of 1923, said that the Muslim delegation which waited on Lord Minto, in this connection, was 'a command performance'. "The Minto-Morley Scheme of communal Representation was forced on the country ; the People were not consulted on the matter".¹ Aged, experienced, far-sighted, but non-pushful Muslims also, and almost all Hindus, spoke and wrote against it. But they were not listened to.

Such is a bird's-eye view of the religio-political history of India in the forty years from 1877-'8 to 1917-'8.² The year 1917 was outstandingly marked by the internment of Mrs. Annie Besant by the Government, because of her activities in connection with the Indian Home Rule Movement which she had started. The sensational trials, acquittal, internment, externment, or imprisonment, of Shri Aravinda Ghosh, Lokamanya B. G. Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai, preceded. A very important political historical event of this period was the 'annexation' of Burma by the British, in the ninth decade of the last century ; much more complete and profitable than the much later 'protection' of Manchuria (now Manchukuo) by the Japanese ; as the latter have set up a Chinese emperor there, however nominal ; somewhat like the rulers of the Indian States, 'advised and guided' by the British Resident or Agent.

The beginning of a new period ; Increase of Communal Riots.

A new period, in Indian history, begins with the Amritsar Massacre of 13th April, 1919.

¹ See B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya's fine work, *The History of the Congress*, pp. 72-76.

² The sketch has been expanded somewhat in the present writer's pamphlet, *Communalism and Its Cure by Theosophy*, (T. P. H., Adyar, Madras.).

The Indian National Congress took to new methods of work ; Non-Co-Operation with the Government in specific ways ; later on, Civil Disobedience of specified laws, like the Salt Act ; Boycott of foreign cloth and other specified goods ; all conditioned by Non-Violence. A grievous outbreak, all over the land, of Communal Riots, commencing with the Moplah Riots in Malabar, began almost simultaneously ; as if someone had switched on a system of electric lights.

Mahatma Gandhi's Verdict.

In 1924, Mahatma Gandhi wrote a long article in his weekly, *Young India*, on the subject. The sum and substance of it was the verdict, "The Hindu is a coward, and the Muslim is a bully." The article was separately printed as a pamphlet, and widely circulated. The present writer addressed an Open Letter to Mahatma Gandhi, with reference to the verdict. The letter asked, "Is it so? If so, why is it so?" The further substance of the letter was to this effect: Are Hindus and Muslims two different species of animals, like sheep and wolves? Obviously not. We see hundreds of Hindus converting themselves into Muslims, every day, all over the land. If Mahatma Gandhi's verdict is correct, then it follows that the coward of yesterday becomes the bully of today, *by mere change of religion*. How is that? Why is that? Is the Hindu really a coward? As an unquestionable fact, Hindu soldiers, (Gurkhas, Rajputs, Garhwalis, Sikhs, Dogras, Jats, Mahrattas, Telugus, Ahirs, and of many other 'castes'), have, in past history, proved their mettle against all sorts of foreign invaders of India. Since 1880, as members of British armies, they have proved it in other countries too, of Asia, Africa, Europe, against other nationals. The Gurkhas and the Sikhs, especially, proved their quality against the Germans and the Turks, in 1914-1918 ; as they did against the British, in the Nepal and Punjab Wars, in the first half of the 19th century. Man to man, as mere fighter, apart from the use of scientific weapons requiring special training and skill, the Indian Soldier, Hindu as well as Muslim, has been recognised and publicly admitted, by British Generals of experience, to be as good as the best to be found anywhere in the world. In the days of the previous World War, a British Field-Marshal (Sir W. Nicholson was perhaps the name, but my memory is not clear) published a letter (*Leader*, Allahabad) praising the Indian Soldier, and said that "Britain had conquered India by the sword—of the Indian". This is a

stark fact of history. Politically and patriotically, it is not to the Indian's credit; militarily, it is. Even this stark fact was quickly hidden away, after the previous Great War was over. As already said, the word A-N-Z-I-A-C, (Australian, New Zealander, Indian, African, Canadian—all 'comrades' in that war) was, after the war, changed into ANZAC; the Indian 'I' was dropped. Clearly, then, the generalisation, that "the Hindu is a coward", is not true, if unqualified.

At the same time, it is true that in the local communal riots, the Hindus have been generally getting the worst of it. This fact is, apparently, the basis for Mahatma Gandhi's too widely stated generalisation. Mahatma Gandhi's condemnation of both Hindu and Muslim, by two different adjectives, was very probably intended to reprove them both, in'o being less cowardly and less bully-ish, respectively. All the same, the question remains: *Why* is it that the Hindu, brave enough in the regular battle-field, becomes a coward in a communal riot in a town or a village?

It may be said that the Hindu, employed in the Army, is properly trained, drilled, disciplined, accustomed to fight; while the ordinary Hindu townsman or villager is not. But, then, no more is the Muslim townsman or villager. Also, the Army is recruited principally from the village population.

The Radical Rot in Hinduism.

Thresh it out in any way, it comes to this, that some Radical Rot is present in the *religion* called 'Hinduism', as currently practised, in the daily life of the town and the village, which makes a coward of the Hindu in such riots; and that he is freed, to a considerable extent, from the operation and effects of that Rot, while he is in the Army.

What is that Radical Rot? After fifty years, and more, of thinking upon the subject, it is the present writer's profounded conviction, which has grown the stronger, the more he has observed and thought, that that Rot is—the Prolific Bacillus of fissiparous *Dis-Unity*, of mutual exclusiveness, often even positive antipathy, instead of sympathetic mutual help and co-operation, which has been created by '*Caste-ism*'; by the conversion of the ancient Socio-Economic-Polity, known as Varna-Āshrama-Dharma, from an Organisation of Vocational Classes, with careful psychological and physiological partition of rights and duties, into a system of crassly and rigidly Hereditary Castes, with all 'rights' to the 'highest' and 'higher' castes, and all 'duties' to the 'lower' and 'lowest.'

It is this 'Hereditary-Caste-Exclusiveness' and appurtenant 'Don't-touch-ism', physical and, even more, psychological, which fosters 'separatism' instead of 'unitism', which engenders intense 'safety-first' short-sighted selfishness, self-righteousness, narrow-mindedness, kills out sympathy, makes co-operation and mutual help impossible, and *therefore* makes cowards of Hindus in communal riots. In the Hindu regiments of the army, while the sentiment of 'Caste-ism', sucked in with mother's milk, is, no doubt, not eliminated wholly; yet, all the circumstances effectively thrust it into the depths of the sub-conscious.

The Bully and the Coward—Explained.

We have also to remember that the bully' is at heart a 'coward'. Samuel Johnson defined the bully as 'a person who terrorises half the town, and is terrorised by the other half.' A Hindi proverb defines the species, similarly, as 'Brave to the weak, cowardly to the strong'. This readily explains why the 'caste-ridden, caste-oppressed, 'help'-less Hindu, who behaves like a coward in communal riots; as soon as he decides to transfer himself into the comparatively more solidarian and less superstitious atmosphere of the Muslim fold, becomes a bully. 'Comparatively', only 'more' and 'less'; very far from 'wholly'. 'Idol-latry' and 'Vedo-latry' are not much worse than 'tombo-latry' and 'Qurano-latry'. The worship of dead bones is not much better than the adoration of lifeless stones. Going into ecstasies over the 'supreme' and absolutely 'unique' and 'unmatchable' 'perfectness' of Rama, or Kṛṣṇa, or Moses, or Zoroaster, or Confucius, or Buddha, or Christ, or Muhammad—is all of the same sort. In every case, the aggressive, pugnacious, violent 'devotee', eulogist, panegyrist, hymn-singer, is 'tasting' his own 'superiority', his own 'egoism', his own conceit or pride, under cover of the 'superiority' of his human eidolon and eikon. 'Every individual Briton is owner of the whole British Empire'; 'every individual German has the right to be the possessor of a greater Empire'; these nationalist, racialist, and at the same time egoist and individualist, sentiments, are of the same psychological character as the assertions of religionist superiority.¹ The true devotee of God is not aggressive, but

¹ How all such 'non-essentials', of all Religions, also bear a very close resemblance to one another; how they all were originally intended to, and can still to some extent, serve a useful purpose of mental discipline and purification; how they

progressive, concessive, even submissive; except when he is rationally convinced that a positive evil has to be contended against.

To the best of my recollection, Mahatma Gandhi agreed, in a subsequent issue of *Young India*, that the corruptness, which had entered into the Hindu religion, *had something* to do with the matter of the Hindu's cowardice in the communal riots. But he did not seem, at that time, to have realised the exact nature, the full extent, and the deep and all-pervading significance of that corruption. Nor has he given any clear indication, during the sixteen years that have elapsed since, that he realises them even now. Of course, he himself is not at all 'orthodox' or 'caste-ridden'. He has been endeavouring might and main, to abolish the vicious absurdity of 'hereditary' untouchability. His youngest son ('birth'-Vaishya) has, with his active approval, married the daughter ('birth'-Brahmana) of Shri C. Rajagopalachari. He has promoted and arranged other such 'intercaste' marriages. He takes food, (strictly vegetarian), from the hands of, and sitting together with, persons of all creeds and 'castes' and 'races', Muslims, Christians, Parsis, Hindu 'untouchables'; provided they are personally clean. Thus, he is obviously not in sympathy with the current *main*, indeed now the *only*, implication of the 'caste-system', viz., avoidance of interdining and intermarriage and 'touch' between different 'castes'.

Mahatma Gandhi's Vague Views

But Mahatma Gandhi seems to think—and this is a very important point, which he does not appear to have thought out with sufficient clarity and comprehensiveness—that the *bread-winning occupation, the means of living*, should be *hereditary*, perhaps even compulsorily. The *reductio ad absurdum* of such a view, worked out to its legitimate consequences, would be that the children of a professor of mathematics must all become professors of mathematics; of a policeman, all policemen; of a cloth-merchant, all cloth-merchants; of a day-laborer, all day-laborers; of an engineer, all engineers; of an agriculturist, all agriculturists; of a cowherd, all cowherds; of a blacksmith, all blacksmiths; of a carpenter, all carpenters.

all can be and have been, corrupted and made the source of Dis-cord instead of Con-cord, has been explained more fully in *The Essential Unity of All Religions*, ch. iv.

Obviously, Mahatma Gandhi cannot possibly be holding such an absurdly extreme and extremely absurd view. That, in very many cases, the son should, and does, follow the occupation of the father, is only natural; it is the line of least resistance; it generally avoids blind trials and failures. But, clearly, it cannot be made into a rule; especially in modern conditions; when population is multiplying excessively; unemployment is increasing in direct ratio; and unlimited expansion and 'multiplication' of the paternal and ancestral occupation, trade, profession, is patently impossible.

The Great Lack therein.

How adjust? An acutely distressful problem. Yet Mahatma Gandhi has not stated his views, systematically or even otherwise, on such matters; vitally important though they are, for Social Reconstruction, and for the future Constitution of India. That Constitution, if it is to be worth anything, must lay down principles for dealing with such acute problems; or rather, indeed, *the* most important of all problems, the problem of the *Economic Structure* of Society, with which all other problems are interdependent; or, rather, on which all other problems are dependent.¹ If he had stated them, with even a hundredth part of the care, persistence, diligence, with which he has preached *charkha* and 'non-violence', the public would have known them well; and, if convinced of their rationality and utility, would have worked his gospel of *charkha*, non-violence, Hindu-Muslim unity, anti-untouchability, etc., much more eagerly and far more *effectively*. Because of his omission, to make a satisfactory pronouncement, solving this problem, we find much vacillation, many and repeated set-backs, in the progress of his 'four-fold' programme; indeed, deadlocks and regresses; and much internal discontent, dissension, factiousness, self-seeking, sordid and even corrupt and venal practices, in the ranks of the Congress, as bad as in the ranks of the governmental public services. It is very unfortunate. But it is Nature's Way.

¹ This problem of the Economic Structure of Society, was expressly avoided by the Nehru Committee's Scheme of Indian Swaraj; which was accepted by the Calcutta Congress of Dec. 1928. This defect may well be regarded as a chief cause of its falling flat, despite acceptance by the Congress. The resolution on 'Fundamental Rights,' adopted by the Karachi Congress in 1931, did not mend the great defect.

It is very rare that a great 'man of action', as Mahatma Gandhi is, is also a 'man of thought', far-seeing, deep-seeing, comprehensive. He himself has often said, "one step enough for me"; and, with frank sincerity, has also said that "he had no scheme, for, if he had, he would have made haste to share it with the public." In his Belgaum Congress (1924) Presidential address, he mentioned a number of separate items, as desirable in Swaraj; but there was no systematic scheme. That is typical of the 'man of action.' He has strokes of genius, sudden inspirations out of his fervent prayers to the Mystery; as to the next step only. His inspired shock-tactics and strategies produce startling results—but only for a while. They die down like fireworks. If he were to base himself strongly, with unshakeable conviction, found after earnest searching and profound thinking, on the Principles of the Ancient Indian Scheme of *Cosmo-polit-an* Socio-Economic-Political Structure, his *tapasya*, his ascetic endeavour, his moral exhortations, would be far more successful.

Corruptions in Both Religions.

In the meanwhile, we see that the nature of the current 'Hinduism' has an essential connection with the Hindu-Muslim problem¹. No doubt, the current 'Muslim-ism' is almost as

¹ Very late, only about four years ago, Mahatma Gandhi thought of Reform in *Education*. Yet it is the very root and source of all other reform. The *Swa-dēshi* and *Swa-rāji* thought on the subject is plainly expressed in the fact that the *Laws* of Manu, the first known Law-giver of India, deal *first* of all, with the *Educational* Organisation of Society and State; then with the *Protective* or political; then the *Economic*; and finally the *Industrial*. Mrs. Annie Besant and her Indian and European Colleagues began work at Educational Reform in 1898—with the foundation of a Central Hindu College at Benares, 'for the rationalisation, liberalisation, and solidarisation of Hinduism and the Hindus'. The history of the Institution, and of its growth into the Benares Hindu University, may now be read in the new edition, (1940, published by the Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Madras), of *The Advanced Text-book of Sanāṭana Dharma*. The reasons are also stated there, why it was not found possible, at that time, to begin with a Central *Theosophical* College, (as the first idea was), which would endeavour to do for *all* religions, what the C. H. C. attempted to do for the hundreds of sects and thousands of castes of the Hindus.

corrupt as the current Hindu-ism. The radical reforms, of different sorts, that have been carried out, in modern Arabia (by king Saud), in Turkey (by Kamal Ataturk), in Persia (by king Reza Shah), and were attempted in Afghanistan (by the luckless over-hasty shallow king Amanulla)—these are enough proof that the manifold degeneracy of Islamic religion and culture has been recognised amply in other countries ; not in India. Even in India there are two strong reform movements within the Muslim fold ; (1) the Ahl-i-Hadis, or Waliabi-s, who are called by 'orthodox' Muslims as the 'Arya Samaji-s of Islam', and (2) the Qadiani-s, or Ahmadiya-s who believe that their Prophet, after whom the sect is named, was the promised Messiah ; the head-quarters of the sect are at Qadian in Punjab.

Indian Mu-slim orthodoxy is as self-satisfied as Indian Hindu orthodoxy ; and the leaders, as well as the rowdy elements, of both, find satisfying, and profitable, occupation in respectively fomenting, and taking part in, Communal riots.

Some features of such corruptness, in both, due to the exaltation of the Non-Essentials, and the neglect of the Essentials, of Religion, for which the Pandits and the Mullas are primarily responsible, have been indicated above. Only one more may be mentioned here. There are many scores of conflicting sects in Islam, if there are hundreds in Hinduism ; and Indian Islam has, together with Hindu converts, taken over, in respect of marriages, many Hindu customs and a good deal of the sense of 'high and low castes'. But that sense is not at all so rigid and strong as in Hinduism ; also, there is no such thing as 'don't-touch-ism', or avoidance of interdining, on the score of 'birth-caste-difference'. Hence the greater 'solidarity' of the Muslims in India.

Quick-doctoring is Quack-doctoring very often.

Our lower nature desires 'magic'-cures, which will free us from disease, *without* requiring us to give up our intemperate and vicious habits. Hindu Maha Sabha leaders (and also Muslim League leaders) think that making 'appeals for unity', against 'the common enemy', 'otherwise that enemy will eat you up', without any clarification of 'aims', is enough to win for them all they want. They are only imitating the British and the German statesmen. Indeed, 'appeals for unity' are flying about in the air, everywhere. What for? For Victory. What will be the Victory for—is never made quite

clear.¹ But such merely emotional appeals are not only futile and fatuous, but positively harmful, promotive of conflicts, wars. Instead of cooling hot heads, they further inflame angry passions. Magic-cures are not to be found. Quick-doctoring is, but too often, only quack-doctoring. It

¹Herr Hitler's War-and-peace aims are, 'To destroy British Imperialism, to restore pre-1914 German boundaries, to recover German colonies, to give a New Order and Freedom to the world, i. e., to spread Nazism, to promote German Imperialism; British rulers' aims are, 'To destroy Hitlerism and Nazism, to maintain British Imperialism, to give a New Order and Freedom to the world, i. e., to spread British Imperialist Democratism'; Deuce Mussolini's, 'To give a New Order to the world, i. e., spread Fascism, and revive, improve upon, surpass the glories of the ancient Roman Empire at its peak of power and maximum of expanse'; M. Stalin's, 'To give Freedom and a New Order to all mankind, and Bolshevise the whole world, in the Stalinian, not the Trotsky-an, way, to destroy Capitalism and Imperialism, and establish super-State-Capitalism and Dictatorialism under cover of a parliamentary democratic constitution (since 1937)'; Japanese rulers', 'To give Freedom to China, and then India, and then gradually to all Asia, from European dominance, under Japan's hegemony, i. e. Imperialism'. And so on. Muslim League leaders' 'war-and-peace-aims' are, 'To preserve the Muslim minority in India from being eaten up by the Hindu majority of 3000 mutually untouchable castes, to preserve Muslim culture from being annihilated by Hindu culture, and to convert, by all sorts of methods, the whole of the Indian People into Muslims, and make of all Hindu-stan, a Pakistan, or Muslimi-stan'. Hindu Maha Sabha leaders' are, 'To save the remnants of Hinduism and Hindu culture from being swallowed up by Muslim-ism, by the simple process of going about uttering challenging cries, making appeals for Unity, and at the same time leaving intact, the virulently proliferating microbe of Dis-Unity, viz., Caste-ism'.

It strikes no one of these, to invite the others to a serious consultation over what exactly is meant by Freedom, New Order, Hindu, Hinduism, Muslim, Islam, Culture, Briton, German, Italian, Russian, Imperialist Democratism, Fascism, Nazism, Bolshevism, Socialism, Communism; and in what respects they coincide, and in what they differ.

frequently ends in causing more and worse diseases, instead of curing any. The fact that Hindu-Muslim animosities have grown more bitter in the last twenty years, is proof. The more, 'Hindu-Muslim Unity' has been 'appealed' for, by Mahatma Gandhi and Congress leaders, (to present a 'united front' against the British Government, in the Non-Violent struggle to secure 'the substance of Independence'), the more Dis-Unity has grown. The more 'un-touchability' has been appealed for, by Mahatma Gandhi, in order to *unite* the 'touchables' and the 'untouchables', the more confirmed has become the *separation* of the two ; and the latter have insisted upon and secured 'separate' reserved seats, if not separate 'electorates'. 'Diplomatic' methods of promoting Disunity have proved stronger than mere emotional appeals for Unity. Laymen cannot help feeling that Mahatma Gandhi has got hold of 'the wrong end of the stick'—like the European 'Warrior-Statesmen', who will fight and beat down the enemy and seize 'power' first, and define 'what for' afterwards. 'The more haste, the less speed'.

'The Wrong End of the Stick' ; 'The More Haste the Less Speed.'

Hindu Maha Sabha leaders have been doing the same thing. They have been, and are, going about the country, saying to the public, f. i., that "It is a wrong notion that India can never achieve independence till there is Hindu-Muslim Unity ; Swaraj can be attained *the day all* the twenty-four crores of Hindus *become united*."¹ Or again, "It will be the height of folly for us to ignore the simple fact that *unless we can unite* the 28 crores of Hindus, we can never fight against the organised attack of those", (i.e., the Pakistan-demanders), "to whom India's welfare and prosperity will always be a second concern...Whether it is the grant of full Dominion Status within a year after the war, uncontaminated by the communal award ; or disowning the Pakistan movement ; or ampler and more active militarisation of India ; or more rapid industrialisation of India's resources ; or removal of the just grievances of Hindus in our provinces—everyone of these matters can be solved *only if* the British Government play the game."² In an article, 'Is this War?', dated 18-2-1940,

¹ Sir Gokul Chand Narang, at Lahore, in the last quarter of 1939.

² Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerji, at Lahore, on 1-3-1941.

Mahatma Gandhi describes "the four pillars built by the British," to support their Empire, viz, "the European interests, the Army, the Princes, the *Communal Divisions*", and says that "the more the Nationalists try to deal with them, as if, they were problems for which they (the Nationalists) were responsible, the firmer they must become".

Very good. Very true.. Granted. But, then, *why* do not, *why* cannot, the Hindus unite? *Why* does not the British Government play the game? It says over and over again, 'I will play the game, to your hearts' content, all right enough, *if* you, Hindus and Muslims, can and do unite!' *Why* do not the Hindus and Muslims unite? *Why* do not, *why* cannot, the Hindu, the Muslim, the Congress leaders, make them unite? *What* prevents?

What is the Secret of bringing about such Unity?

The *Secret of Unity* remains to be discovered by Mahatma Gandhi, and his Congress lieutenants, as between Hindus and Muslims; by the Hindu leaders, as between the two to three thousand 'castes' and 'sub-castes' and 'sub-sub-castes' and hundreds of sects, of Hindus, (which outrageously patent fact, viz., that the Hindus are a crumbling jumble of so many thousand 'minorities', compelled Mahatma Gandhi himself to write, as he did, sometime in the last quarter of 1939, that "the Hindu majority is only a paper majority"); by the Muslim leaders, as between the old 'seventy-two' and many new sects of Islam; by the British statesmen, as between British interests and Indian interests, on the one hand, and, on the other, between 'Capital interests' and 'Labor interests' within Britain itself; by the omnipotent rulers and dictators of Europe including Britain, (now so busy with the supremely civilised work of enslaving and exploiting the poorer classes or masses of their own countries and the weaker peoples of other countries, on the one hand, and, on the other, of getting their peoples to butcher one another), as between the nations of Europe; by the thought-leaders of the modern world, as between the several 'ideologies', mainly, individualism-capitalism, oligarchic-imperialist-democratism, fascism-nazism, and socialism-communism; and finally, by the priests of the several religions, as between all the creeds. *How, where*, is that *Secret of Unity*, that panacea, which only can, (if anything can at all), mitigate and minimise, (though it may not wholly cure), all the manifold and terrible evils of Dis-unity which are operating today so virulently

in all Departments of Human Life—*How, where, is it to be found?*

One of the most intimately trusted of Mahatma Gandhi's colleagues, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, (the 'Frontier Gandhi'), a saintly-minded person by all reputation, seems to have had a glimpse of the secret; very partial, and probably also only temporary, though it was; for he does not seem to have taken any active steps according to his glimpse. At the Anti-Communal Conference held in the Bradlaugh Hall, on 9-3-1941, in Lahore, he said that "there could never be real Hindu-Muslim Unity, *unless they tried to understand each other's Religion and Culture*. He said that the *gulf* which existed in 1919, instead of being bridged, had been *widened*...He regretted that Hindus and Muslims were *not trying to understand each other's Religion and Culture*. *Unless they* did so, that problem would remain unsolved. The mere passing of lengthy resolutions and making of speeches would not lead them to their Goal of Communal Unity". (*H. Times*, 11-3-1941).¹

History tells, plainly; but we will not hear.

All past history has been declaring that Secret. Yet

¹What Khan A. G. Khan has done himself, positively, to promote such understanding, is not known to the present writer. He presented a copy, of the first edition of *The Essential Unity of All Religions*, to M. Gandhi, while the latter was in jail in Yerowda (Poona), in Dec. 1932; and another to Khan A. G. Khan, in New Delhi, in 1937. It is not known what use they made of the book. There is *no copyright* in the book. It quotes *parallel texts* from the Scriptures of all the great living religions; most numerous from the Hindu and the Muslim Scriptures. If Khan A. G. Khan desires to promote understanding of each other's religion and culture, between Hindus and Muslims, he should himself take, and induce Mahatma Gandhi to take, steps for the widest possible circulation of *such* books; *such*, not necessarily *it*, by any means. He, or M. Gandhi, or both together, themselves, or through trusted friends, can and should make their own compilations, and have them circulated, all they can. A collection of the best Scriptural texts of any religion, with rational, benevolent, philanthropic commentary, embodies the highest and best aspects of the Civilisation and Culture corresponding to that Religion.

we are blind and deaf to it. Always, a Religion and a corresponding Civilisation have taken birth, grown, flourished, lived, decayed, died together. A Religion and a Social Structure, together, in combination, as Soul and Body, make the *Unified Life* of a nation, a people. The Soul is the *unifying principle* of the millions and billions of *separate* cells, tissues, organs of the Body. Religion is the *unifying principle* of the thousands and millions of *separate* human beings of Society. But a *new* Religion, of the same sort as those we have had so far; those which, because of the circumstances surrounding their birth, have had to begin with only a local and tribal appeal; such would not serve the purpose of Humanity to-day, in the present conditions of the world. Commerce and Science, in co-operation, have brought all nations together, spatially; and they wish and need to *unite the nations also, morally*. But the several Religions are in dire conflict. They do not unite. They separate. They do not reconcile even all their own followers. They antagonise others, provoke them, make enemies of them, positively. We have seen before what the Churches could do to bring Peace and a Rational Order to Mankind, *if* they discharged their duty in the truly religious spirit, (vide pp. 8-9, 76-77, *supra*).

What the Human World needs now, is a World Religion, *interwoven* with a World Order, which will *synthesise* and *reconcile all* Religions, all Nations, all Races; will *not* even dream of *abolishing* or suppressing, oppressing, subjugating any.

Who is most responsible for the failure?

The leaders of the Hindu Maha Sabha and the Hindu leaders of the Congress are particularly to blame for neglecting and failing to see that the *Bhagavad-Gita* and the *Laws of Manu*, the Principles of the Vedanta and the Varn-āshrama Dharma, *rightly interpreted*, provide just this World-Religion *interwoven* with World Order, and make of the whole Human Race a *Universal Brotherhood* without invidious distinctions, in terms of superiority and inferiority, of caste, creed, color, race, or sex. No people have had finer psycho-physically scientific principles and ideals of Social Structure given to them than the Hindus. None have soiled and fouled their principles worse. The other religions too, if their scriptures are *rightly interpreted*, can be seen to have the same universal appeal, now; though perhaps with less specification in respect of World Order, less clear

partition of rights-and-duties between the several vocational classes.

How far is a Third Party to Blame ?

The machinations of a Third Party, the policy and devices of *divide et impera* operated by the Ruling power, are said to be the cause of division between Hindu and Muslim. Are they the cause also of divisions between Hindus and Hindus, and Muslims and Muslims ? Some will say, they are. Very well ; but why do such machinations succeed ? You cannot 'set the Thames on fire.' Only when and where there is inflammable material, fire catches. Are not Hindus and Muslims fighting because they have corrupted and misunderstood their respective religions, and thereby made themselves fools and tools of the alleged Third Party ? It is no use blaming others. Let us blame ourselves, and cure ourselves, first. Then the others will follow suit, very quickly. "Why beholdest thou the mote in thy brother's eye, and considerest not the beam in thine own ?"

It is true, also, no doubt, that the British rulers' state-craft is much to blame for the present state of things.

Some 25 years ago, the Hon'ble Mr. G. K. Gokhale said that, in India, the three sides of the triangle were the Hindus, the Muslims, the British, and any two sides were greater than the third. A 'foreign' Government, which wishes to remain 'foreign' ; to subserve those 'foreign' interests in a manner inconsistent with, even antagonistic to, the interests of the Indian People ; and not to promote the latter ; though, by promoting the latter, it would be subserving the best and most real interests of the British People too ; such a Government, guided by the considerations which inspire the enrrtent short-sighted cunning (and not wise) Diplomaey, would, in the triangular condition, naturally think it desirable to prevent the other two sides of the triangle from coming together. This is the well-known poliey of all war, visible all round today. Every belligerent is trying, might and main, to create splits in the rival camp, to gain allies for itself, to draw away helpers from the side of the enemy.

Dr. G. S. Arundale's *N. I. Survey*, 18-3-1941, says :—

"Government must not harp on the need for a United India as a pre-requisite for constitutional advance. For Hindus and Muslims *can never unite*, as they ought to, *so long as British authority dominates*. If one thing more than another has provoked the most moderate-minded among Indians, it is

the disingenuousness of the offer of Dominion Status coupled with the demand for internal unity. The future of India cannot be dependent, as was pointed out at the Conference, (of Leaders of all parties in Bombay), on Mr. Jinnah and Gāndhi-ji embracing each other in unity. No great step forward has been taken in the history of any country except with risks, and in the teeth of imminent and threatening opposition. If Britain will not throw a bridge of conciliation now between itself and the Nationalists in India, then how else can the latter deal with the problem ?”

Instead of making such a bridge, Britain's rulers have dug a deep chasm between Hindus and Muslims, by the device of *Separate Electorates* with very heavy *Weightage* to Muslims everywhere. They have thus vitiated the whole moral and mental atmosphere of the country ; subtly played upon and powerfully stimulated greeds, hopes, thoughts of power and privilege over others beyond due ; and newly created antagonisms ; where all concerned had settled down, on the whole, to mutual accommodation, co-operation, good understanding, study and appreciation of the best aspects of Samskr̥t-Hindī and Arabic-Persian-Urdu Culture. As a fact, before the separatist spirit was started by the ‘Morley-Minto *Re-forms*’ (which should be called *De-forms*), and while Joint Electorates were in force ; quite often, in the case of many elective Municipal and District Boards, *more* Muslim members were gladly elected, than are now, under the system of separate seats, even with the weightage. With Joint Electorates, both Hindu and Muslim leading men naturally and instinctively took, and would again take, care to consult the interests of *both*, and to be popular with both communities. All this friendly feeling has been ruined by this separative device of state-craft. The result is that the chasm created between the two, is now extending and dividing off Britain from both, also. As Sheikh Sā’dī has said :

Miyāné do ṭan āṭash angēkḥṭan,

Na dāniṣṭ k-andar-miyān sokhtan.

(Who made a pit of fire between two friends,

Knew not himself would fall therein some day).

Yet it is not too late to mend. Peace is possible all round—between Britain and India, between Britain and Germany, between Japan and China. Only the hearts of the rulers have to soften a little. But, alas !, Nature has ordained that iron shall not soften without fire, and water and air in combination shall eat it up.

After all this has been said, it still remains true, as the nett result of all these considerations, that the Hindu religio-political leaders in the *first* place, and the Muslim in the *second* place, are more to blame than any Third Party; and that the Third Party is to blame only in the third place.

The manifold evils born of corrupt 'Caste-ism'.

The chief, indeed the sole, cause of all the troubles and degradations of India, is—the *Shifting* of the Social System from the basis of Spontaneous Variation, or Mutation, i. e., Temperamental Vocational *Aptitude* and *Actual Occupation*, to that of Heredity and its immediate consequence, Dis-unity, de-solidation, dis-organisation, fissi-parousness, loss of high principles and ideals, loss of fine traditions of duty nobly discharged, loss of cohesion, each little group going its own way and repudiating organic responsibility.

To enumerate a few of the evils born of it: (a) The coming into existence of more and more new 'castes'; partly through matings of persons of different 'castes', and therefore cast 'out of caste' with their progeny; and partly through the selfish petrefaction of local trade-guilds into exclusive 'castes'; so that, by the Census Report of 1939, between two and three thousand separate 'castes' have come into existence, which cannot interdine and intermarry; the Report for 1891, put the number precisely at 2378; (b) mutual exclusiveness, tending to jealous anti-pathology and active opposition, on the slightest occasion; (c) the fostering of selfish vested interests, grabbing of all rights, and shirking of all duties, by the self-styled 'higher castes'; (d) the endeavour to confine wealth, executive power or authority, learning even more, to special hereditary 'castes' and 'groups'; (e) the growth, in numbers, of the unworthy, and diminution of the worthy, in these castes or groups, because of lack of due incentive to be worthy, on the one hand, and lack of due penalty for being unworthy, on the other; (f) ever greater and greater misuse of such authority, learning, wealth, by the irresponsible holders; (g) ever worse disorganisation and confusion of the general social life; (h) ever greater increase, within the Hindu fold, of arrogances, insolences, greeds, on the one hand, and jealousies, hatreds, fears, on the other; in short, vices of all sorts; and antagonism with non-Hindus, because of self-righteous and conceited-pretensions to 'untouchability' because of superior 'purity', (the converse of 'untouchability' because of 'impurity'); (i) the deliberate fostering of false superstitions

and blind faith among the so-called 'lower' castes by the so-called 'highest' castes, in order to keep them frightened, cowering, subservient; (j) the falling of the 'higher' castes themselves, gradually, under the sway of those superstitions, and the forgetting of most of the real higher spiritual knowledge; (k) the *weakening* of the 'Hindu' people; the accumulation of wealth, in the hands of comparatively small groups, and in temples; the growth of luxurious and relaxing habits and vices; and consequent *temptation* to others to invade and 'divide and rule'; (l) finally, the present discontent, unrest, struggle, general turmoil, between all sections of the Hindus, and of the Indian People, and between the People and the Governments, in 'British' India as well as 'Indian' India, i. e., the Indian States.

Analogies elsewhere.

The process has its analogies everywhere, in all departments of life, amongst every people. The trustee makes himself the beneficiary; the custodian transforms himself into the proprietor; the public 'servant' comes to regard himself and behaves as the public 'master'; the magistrate, the judge, the king, instead of being the friend of the good, becomes a patron and partner of the wicked, a promoter of espionage and all its manifold evils, a 'gangster', oppressor instead of protector. The motive forces are, as ever, the elemental egoistic individualistic short-sighted appetites, passions, emotions—when the control over them weakens, of the altruistic socialistic far-seeing impulses and sentiments. Pride of 'high birth', 'blue blood', 'divine right of kings', 'superior race'; ministers murdering weak and luxurious kings and usurping kingdoms; *aristocracy*, *bureaucracy*, *plutocracy*, *theocracy*, *hagiocracy*, *timocracy*, *democracy*, *mobocracy*, *ecclesiasticism*, *feudalism*, *militarism*, *capitalism*, *imperialism*, *proletarianism*, *socialism*, *communism*—all these exemplify the working of the same elemental instincts, urges, motives, *running to extremes*; running out of the control of the opposite instincts and urges, which would restrict them to the 'golden mean', and thus reconcile all. The war raging in East and West; the riots of Hindus and Muslims; the fights between animals—all illustrate the same basic facts and laws of psychology. The *Mahā-bhārata* expressly says that rival rulers and their armies behave in exactly the same way as two dogs preparing to fight, and then actually clinching, for a bone.

Some Fresh Riots ; and their Lessons.

The communal riot of Dacca, which began in March, 1941, seems to have become a small 'civil war' by the end of the month. The non-Congress Ministry has failed to deal properly with the situation. Some twenty-five thousand refugees (apparently all Hindus) are reported to have fled into the neighbouring Indian State of Tipperah, and other British districts. The Government, all over India, have latterly followed the policy of not mentioning the respective religions of the killed, wounded, and looted. The number of the killed, in the Dacca riots, does not appear to have been regularly reported, officially. Certainly many scores have been murdered, if not hundreds, according to unofficial reports. The numbers of the wounded have not appeared in the papers. They must be many hundreds. Arson and plunder have been rampant. Similar very violent riots occurred in Dacca about ten years ago. Some two thousand are officially reported to have been arrested in Dacca and the sub-division of Narayanganj now. The extent of the rioting, and of the crimes committed, may be inferred from the number of these arrests. Very probably, many innocent persons have been arrested ; and many real criminals must have escaped.

Other serious riots have been breaking out, since then, in different parts of the country. At the other end of India, in Ahmedabad, some 1500 miles away from Dacca, similar riots broke out in the third week of April, 1941, and a few days later, as these pages are going through the press, the papers report that 76 have been killed ; over 300 injured ; some 400 arrested ; two of the most crowded quarters of the town laid in ruins, by incendiaries ; five-storey houses turned into heaps of debris, (numbers of persons burnt within them, unknown) ; and about a hundred thousand persons fled from the town. The 'auto-nomous' Ministry-less Government and Governor of Bombay have failed to prevent all this ; as the non-Congress Ministry and Government and Governor of Bengal have failed to prevent the riots of Dacca. Indeed, riots have broken out (and are going on, as this is being printed) in Bombay itself.

The full narrative, on the subject of the Dacca Riots, of Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerji, (M. L. A., Bengal, Working President, for this year, of the Hindu Maha Sabha, ex-Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University), is published in the weekly *Mahratta* (Poona), of 25-4-1941. It reads like a des-

cription of a sack of a town and adjoining country, by an invading army, and speaks of women outraged, and men and women forcibly converted, and 'Pakistan' and 'Muslim Raj' proclaimed, etc., over and above the other crimes. And it *lays all the blame* on the Government and the predominantly Muslim Ministry of Bengal. But it does *not go to the root of the matter*, the degeneracy of Hinduism and Hindus; has nothing to say about the root-remedy; and only 'appeals' to the Hindus to "organise to defend themselves." How organise? By drilling and disciplining, in the manner of 'Civic Guards'? *Government orders prevent all such drilling and disciplining*, except under Governmental official supervision and control. And *what for?* To fight against Muslims? They can organise better. They are more solidarian. The Hindu who has injected, into his body-communal, the deadly *virus* of mutually-repellant, *disrupting, dis-organising* hereditary 'caste-ism'—how can such Hindu talk of *organising*? And will 'organising for fighting' among ourselves, serve the highest and best purposes of the Indian People, as a whole? Shall we still remain blind to the consequences of 'Organising for War', and of 'Armament-Racing'—with the Horrible European War going on before our eyes? Do we want a Spanish Civil War in India? Let us be wiser. Let us 'organise' by all means; but let us 'Organise for Peace,' for Prosperity; Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Parsis, Sikhs, Jainas, Buddhists, Jews, all together, side by side; for the well-being of all. 'Organising for Peace' automatically includes organising for defence, for defensive war, when wholly unavoidable. 'Organising for War' does *not include*, nay, *militates against*, 'Organising for Peace.' The Right of Private Self-Defence is always indefeasible; is recognised by all written and unwritten law, ancient or modern; and must be exercised when necessity is felt, after full and careful deliberation, and all possible endeavour to secure agreement and peace has failed. But the Duty of Co-operation, consultation, co-ordination, comes before the Right of Defence; that Right follows after the Duty has been fully attempted to be discharged, and has been frustrated by others.

Let us, then, set a good and high example to those who are, by science-created machinery, far stronger than we are, and are destroying each other—the Peoples of the West. Let us endeavour to justify the old saying, *Ex Oriente Lux*. Let us not revile others. Let us see our own very serious faults;

may, grievous sins. 'If Hindus have been and are being beaten, maltreated, trampled upon, it is because they have *deserved* it; are continuing to *deserve* it; because they maltreat one another among themselves.' Some Hindu leaders have raised the cry, 'Abolish Untouchability'. But they have not seen, have not said, that 'Untouchability' and consequent maltreatment of Untouchables, the 'Depressed classes', *cannot* be abolished, unless and until 'Hereditary Caste-ism' is done away with; is replaced by 'Vocational-Class-ism'.

Let us root out and fling away this miserable, this sinful, 'Caste-ism.' Let us replace it by the true ancient Fourfold-Vocational-Scheme. Let us thereby *spiritually*, psychologically, rationally, intellectually, *conquer all* who are, or are inclined to be, our *foes* to-day, by converting them into staunch *friends* and *co-workers*, in the Social Organism. If we fail to do this, 'Hinduism' is bound to perish in ignominy. If we do this, it will flourish anew exceedingly; *not* under the name of 'Hinduism'; but under its freshly renewed ancient, true, deeply significant name—MANAVA DHARMA, THE RELIGION OF MAN, OF ALL HUMANITY. The word Hind-ū or Hind-ī, could then remain as the true equivalent of 'Indian,' which it is.

The Duty of Hindus and their Leaders.

The Best Way of Reconciling.

Unless and until those who call themselves Hindus, realise that they themselves are to blame, that the fault lies with them more than with any others, for the present condition of things, unless they realise this, and set about applying the right remedy, 'Hinduism' and 'Hindus', as such, have no future.

Mere perfervid 'appeals'—'Don't fight', 'Be good boys', 'Unite'—are futile. 'Your *creeds differ*, but *you* should *agree*'—this will *never* work.

What *will* work is, to teach *all* concerned: "Your *creeds agree*, indeed are *one* and the *same*, in *essentials*. In *superficials*, they may *differ*; as dresses. Hinduism is *not* 'Caste-ism', but a Cosmo-polit-an Socio-politico-economical Scheme, which aims, and sets forth, scientifically, the best Plan to provide suitable *Means of Living* for every human being, in return for *appropriate work*; a Plan to provide every Worker with Suitable Work, and every Work with Suitable Worker. Into this Scheme, therefore, *any one*, of any creed, race, nation, can come in, without losing (indeed,

rather, *gaining* the best chance for developing) the best features of his or her distinctive peculiarity, individuality, personality, originality".

This is what Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress Hindu leaders and the Hindu Maha Sabha leaders, (and also the Muslim League and other leaders) ; who may sincerely wish well to all Mankind ; and are not obsessed by considerations of personal or communal or national or racial 'ambitions' and 'prestige'; or bemused by mere names and words ; or hallucinated by catch-words and catch-phrases ; or deluded by the glamour of mere 'custom'; should *teach and preach*, broadcast, night and day. They should do this much more diligently and persistently than all the other things they are now teaching, preaching, doing. It will secure for the Congress, Hindu, Muslim, leaders, all the things their better natures consciously or subconsciously want, in their best forms ; which things, their present activities can never secure for them.

If anyone says, '*Preaching* such Religion is no good' ; then the reply is, '*Preaching* mere Unity, Charkha, Anti-Untouchability, etc., is less than no good'. All public agitation, public preaching, lecturing, writing, journalising—is endeavour to *Educate* the Public and to form Public Opinion. Every public worker, every ruler, dictator, communal or political leader, is endeavouring to *educate*, (indeed to 'hypnotise', in the case of the 'rulers' and 'dictators') the Mass-Mind. The thesis, the argument, the claim, the profound conviction and emphatic assertion, of this book is :

The Teaching and Preaching of the Common Essentials of All Religions, which Essentials Constitute a Universal World Religion, interwoven with a Psycho-physically Scientific Rational Scheme of Social Order, is the *very best* possible way of the *Right* Education, and thence, Reconciliation and Co-operative Organisation, of all Mankind, today.

Occasions for Communal Rioting : Sacrifice : Its Real Meaning.

It has been said above that, side by side with the 'advance' of the new Congress movement since the fateful year 1919, has gone on the 'advance' of communal rioting.

Formerly, the main occasion for it was the Īd-uz-ẓohā

(or Baqr-id) festival of the Muslims, which occurs once a year, in the month of Hajj, the 'Pilgrimage' to Macca. On this occasion, in Arabia, where the custom originated, a camel is usually 'sacrificed'; sometimes a sheep or goat. In India, the cow began to be sacrificed by Muslims. This has always hurt Hindu sentiment very deeply. The *real sacrifice*, which is recommended, nay enjoined, within limits, *by all religions*, is *self-sacrifice*.¹ But human perversity has

¹ See *The Essential Unity of All Religions*, pp. 463-473, etc., for quotations of *texts* from Hindu, Muslim, Jewish, Christian, Buddhist, Jaina *Scriptures*, on the subject. The English word 'sacri-fice' etymologically means 'good deed'. The Arab word is *qurb-ānī*. The Skt., *bali-dāna*. *Īd*, in Arabic, means 'rejoicing'; *zohā* is 'morning', 'forenoon', also 'breakfast'; *baqr* means 'new', 'fresh', also 'young cattle'. *Qurb-ānī* means 'that which brings the human soul near, *qurb*, to God'. *Bali* means 'giving', 'giving new life', 'vivi-fying', 're-viv-ing', as by food, 'giving of help and service', 'giving up oneself, one's life, to God, to the service of God by the service of fellow-creatures'; also 'slaying of the lower nature, in order to give the higher nature effectively to God'. Baqr-īd sacrifice is to be performed once a year, in the month of Hajj, the 'Pilgrimage' to Macca. 'Bali-dāna', '*self-offering to God*', and '*giving food to domestic and certain other animals*', is enjoined as part of the daily prayer-ritual of the Hindu; also, of special kinds, is to be offered on special occasions, for special purposes.

A well-known Samskr̥t verse, ironically condemning the 'sacrifice' of innocent and useful animals, says, "The deity which accepts such sacrifices was once asked by a faithful devotee—'May I sacrifice a wolf to you'? The answer came 'No!'. 'A tiger?' 'No, No!'. 'Then a lion?' 'No, No, No!'. 'Only a lamb?'. 'Yes, such deities, spirits, as I am, love only to slaughter the weak, the helpless, the innocent, like sheep!'. "

Na vṛkam, na cha vā vyāghram,
 simham na-iva cha na-iva cha ;
 Ajā-putram balim daḍyāt ;
 Dēvo durbala-gḥāṭakah.

The real meaning of the 'Symbology', (i.e. the imitation, in terms of Matter, of the processes of the Spirit), of Yajña, Bali, and Yātrā, of Qurbānī and Hajj, is, that the soul,

substituted the much easier *other-sacrifice*, of the most innocent, most help-ful, and most help-less domestic animals, for the very difficult *self-sacrifice*. It has inverted good into Evil ; Khudā into Khudī ; Azazel into Satan ; Dēva into Dāitya. *Demon est Deus inversus*. Of the more numerous followed religions, Hinduism (and its offshoot Sikhism), Judaism, Muslimism, continue the practice of animal sacrifice. Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, Jainism, (these last two being offshoots of Hinduism also), have avoided it.

So far as the *eating* of flesh is concerned, the followers of *all* the above-named religions (except Jainism) practice it. Hindus, (barring a few caste groups), eat all sorts of fish, flesh, fowl, except the cow, because of its 'sacredness'. Muslims, (barring a few Sufis), eat all sorts of fish, flesh, fowl, except the pig, because of its 'uncleanness'. Muslims 'religiously sacrifice' camels, cows, goats, sheep, (usually the female animal), as a regular annual institution, ordained by 'religion'. Hindus 'religiously sacrifice' buffaloes, pigs, goats, sheep, fowls, (usually the male animal), occasionally, for 'merit', not as a matter of religious command, but of option. Christians eat both beef and pork impartially, together with all other sorts of fish, flesh, fowl ; but do not 'sacrifice' any, do not invite 'God' to share the bloody feast.

If the 'ceremonial sacrifice and eating' of animals were *substituted* for the daily eating of them, and were *restricted* to special days only, there would be some intelligible reason for it ; viz., it would be a sop to the 'd-evil' in man, never wholly eradicable. But *adding* it to the daily consumption — is not easy to understand. What *is* easy to understand is, that the vast slaughter of animals and eating of blood-meats, and the drinking of immeasurable quantities of intoxicants, leads, as a natural consequence, to the equally enormous 'consumption' of toxic-brained and bloody-minded 'human' beings, *by each other*, with extreme violence, in such Mad and Bloody Wars ; and with disguised and lesser-seeming violence, in the Frantic Competitions and Frustrations of daily life.

having wandered afar, searched for, and found the Universal Self within it-Self at last, yields it-self up to It completely ; and *no* more feels that it has a *separate* existence. Its *separatism* is extinguished. This is the true 'Spiritual Freedom' ; *Moksha* in Skt. ; *Najāt* in Ar.-Per.

Non-rationality, Arbitrariness, of Religious Beliefs.

That the milch-cow should be held sacred by Hindus, and the scavenger pig held unclean by Muslims, for secular and scientific reasons, is right and proper and justifiable. But that these should be so held 'religiously'; that sacrifices of animals 'please God', and should be performed 'religiously', whether of camel, cow, buffalo, pig, sheep, goat, or cock; or that the sacrifice of one kind of animal 'pleases God', and of another 'displeases Him'; these are matters of wholly 'nonrational' and 'arbitrary' belief, of 'dark and mysterious' sentiments and motives. To expose such motives to the light of reason only hurts those sentiments; though a surgeon has to hurt.

This is the greatest misfortune of Man, that Religion has become, or has mostly been so far, 'non-reason-able', and therefore creates War, not Peace. When it becomes 'reason'-able, as it has become, in Vedānta (Ātma-Vidyā). Gnosis (Mystis), Sufism, then, it creates Peace Within and Without. While striving to realise (and also to spread) such Religion, as Supremely Rational, as indeed the very culmination of Reason, Reasonableness, Rationality, as the Eternal World Religion; we have to accept and deal with these conflicting arbitrary 'sacificial' sentiments as facts; somewhat as we accept the more peacefully, or rather less pugnaciously, different national dresses and languages.

To avoid misunderstanding, it may be noted here, that, in the deepest Meta-physical sense, *all* the facts and laws of animate and sub-animate (for there is no *in*-animate) Nature, that any science deals with, are, at bottom, arbitrary, non-rational. One person likes salts: another, sweets; fire burns; snow cools; iron rusts with air and water; gold does not. Certain combinations of certain chemicals, produce certain effects; others, others. Some powders flare up in flames if cast into water; others are soaked and lose explosive power. These are arbitrary facts of Nature. Reason only *sees* relations, of cause and effect; and enables man thereby to produce certain effects by bringing into operation appropriate causes. *Why* a given effect is produced by a given cause is beyond reason. *All desire* is non-reason-able, arbitrary. In this *meta-physical* sense, the whole World-process is Non-Reason-able, an Arbitrary and Illusory Creation of the Will-Desire-Imagination-Ideation, of the Mystery; as we saw before, (see pp. 130-140, *supra*). But in the ordinary *ethical* sense, the words non-rational, irrational, un-reason-able, arbitrary, have

another sense and value; and, for the practical, i.e., ethical, purposes of daily life, 'rational' means some act of which a useful beneficial result is discernible; ir-rational or un-reason-able, some act which is likely to result in some ill; and non-rational, that of which neither good nor ill result is plainly observable.

A Historical Fact.

Such being the case, we can easily see that the Muslim introduction of cow-sacrifice into Hindu-*stan*, (where it has been held in horror and abomination, since the days of Kṛṣṇa, who is said by tradition, to have put a stop to it, 5,000 years ago, because of medical and economico-agricultural reasons); this cow-sacrifice became a major *casus belli*. A number of Muslim rulers, including some of the Delhi Emperors, have issued commands *forbidding* cow-sacrifice. But the commands did not have permanent effect on the Muslim Mullas and their followers. The Hindus, having once lost sovereignty over parts of the country, have been steadily pushed back more and more. It has been said before, that the Hindu soldier has proved his mettle against foreign invaders, in the past; Persians, Scythians, Alexander's Greeks. This was the case, down to about the beginning of the Christian era. Till then, the 'class-caste-system' had not ossified into 'Caste-ism'; and immigrants, of all sorts, used to be *absorbed* into the 'Vocational-Class-System'. Thereafter, the elasticity, and appurtenant vitality and strength, began to be lost. The Hindu soldier still fought bravely. But the canker of internal 'caste-ist' dissensions, centring round the struggle between Buddhism decaying (because of excessive moral laxity and Black Magic Practices of the 'left-hand', 'sinister', Tantra, among the Bhikkhus—like the Black Mass among Christians, and similar degenerate practices among groups or sects of Jews and Muslims—and indiscriminate matings and marryings among the laity), and Hinduism reviving (with the excessive cry of 'purer castes', 'restrictions in marriage', and 'renewal of Veda-ritual', led by Kumārila, Mandana, Shankara); this canker had begun eating at the heart of Hinduism. Treacheries and betrayals, in the rulers' religio-political surroundings, and quarrels in the army-camps—due to 'caste'-disputes as much as to individual ambitions—these nullified mere fighting courage, brought defeats, and thence the ever greater degeneration and degradation of Hinduism. Self-reverence, Self-knowledge, Self-control, Self-government, Fine Culture—go together.

Some more Historical Facts.

To understand the nature and the causes of the present Hindu-Muslim disputes, such historical facts as the above should be borne in mind. Also some others, equally undisputed or little disputed ; as thus :

(1) Hindus never invaded Arabia, Persia, or Turkestan, in known history. Islamic Arabia, Persia, Turkestan have invaded India.

(2) Christians, fleeing from Jewish and Roman persecution, came to South India, in the very first century after Christ ; were given protection by the Hindu kings ; have grown in numbers steadily, flourished, made converts, without hindrance, throughout India. Parsis, fleeing from Muslim persecution, in the first century after Muhammad, found refuge in India ; have thriven greatly ; been helped in every way, instead of being oppressed, though a very microscopic minority, under Hindu kings ; and would surely have increased in numbers also, if they had cared to make converts. So too have such colonies of Jews been protected, as established themselves in the South. Arabian Muslim traders were welcomed by the Hindu kings of the Malabar coast ; helped to settle in the South country ; and Hindu girls were married to them ; (Ma-pillā, I have been told, means 'son-in-law' in the South language). It is from these early settlers that the present large Moplah population has arisen. Hindu kings and wealthy private citizens have gone out of their way to build churches, synagogues, mosques, agyāris (agni-āgāra-s, fire-temples), and other such places of worship, for persons of other faiths ; and given them every facility to follow their own forms of worship. Indeed, in matters of religion, Hindus have been far more helpful to others than to themselves. They are beginning to find that they have made a bad mistake, and gone to extremes in both respects. If they had not forgotten the true meaning of their own religion ; if they had continued to keep open, as formerly, the doors of its fold, and allowed others to enter into it and take up their nature-ordained places in its Occupational Scheme ; if they had not added to their welcome, the insult of 'don't-touch-ism', of exclusion from *com-mensa* and *con-nubium*, of not taking, but only giving, girls in marriage ; if they had not, thereby, deprived their good deeds of all grace, sinned their mercies, vitiated their virtues, made their kindness look like contempt, and turned the gratitude of the incomers into anger ; while weakening themselves by caste-dissensions ;

then, very probably, 'communal' troubles would not have been born; though others may have arisen; for, man cannot hope for perfect peace. But—'Follow the Middle Way'—is an ever-good rule.

(3) Hinduism gave up making and taking converts, about 2000 years ago. Under pressure of new circumstances, it has begun to do so again, very recently, here and there. But it is not succeeding, to any noticeable extent. For two reasons. The 'orthodox' are still greatly opposed to such assimilations. The stronger reason is that there is *no such thing* left now, in practice, as a homogeneous 'Hinduism', which could be given to and accepted by a would-be convert. In fact, there is no 'Hindu'. There are only 'Hindus of this or that *particular caste*'. Feeling this difficulty, Lokamanya Tilak, and Maha Sabha leaders like Shri V. D. Savarkar, have been trying to put forward comprehensive definitions. These definitions have not met with any perceptible acceptance; are really not satisfactory; do not solve the difficulty; because they connect Vēda-Dharma inseparably with that part of the Earth which is now known as India; because they think in terms of territorial patriotism and nationalism; not of Mankind and Spiritual Philosophy, Psychology and Physiology. The present writer is not aware that Mahatma Gandhi has ever tried to define to others, or even to himself, what exactly constitutes a Hindu; though he calls himself a Hindu. Hinduism now means heterogeneous 'Caste-ism'; and no 'caste', as such, is willing, generally speaking, to take a person from another 'caste', much less from another religion, into itself. Hence the failure of Swāmī Shraddhānanda's Shuddhi movement.¹

¹ Swami Shraddhānanda was one of the greatest workers, and leaders of the Ārya Samāj, after the founder, Swāmī Dayānanda; very patriotic, very public-spirited, very frank and fearless; a person of strong likes and dislikes, (and, therefore, also, the object of strong likes and dislikes) liable to sudden changes of opinion, like all energetic 'men of action'. He was a staunch friend all through, of Hakim Ajmal Khan, the famous benevolent and charitable physican of Delhi, founder of the Tibbi-Āyurvedic College of Delhi, popular alike with Hindus and Muslims, who was President of the Congress at Delhi in 1918. He had also many other trusted Muslim friends. After the outbreak of riots in 1921, and reports of many forcible conversions to Islam, he started the Shuddhi

(4) The word Hindu is not to be found in the older books of India, preceding the coming in and settlement of Muslims. The origin of the word is 'Sindhu', which occurs in the Veda-s. The 'Sindhu' river and the tract of country it waters, were called by the earlier Parsis, 'Hindhū'; by the Ionians (Yavanas) or Greeks, 'Indus' and 'India'; by the later Muslimised Persians, Hind and Hindo-stan. The inhabitant of Hind is Hind-ī (as

movement, as a counteractive, for making re-converts, and also new converts, to Hinduism. At the annual session of the Hindu Maha Sabha at Benares, in 1923, the present writer spoke to him of the difficulties, mentioned in the text above, in the way of making new converts to Hinduism. The writer also proposed, to the Sabha, at the session, that it should resolve three things, viz., to stop the practice of 'outcasting', 'excommunication'; to forbid the questioning of persons as to their 'caste', at temples, places of pilgrimage, 'sacred' places of bathing; to teach broadcast, the simple Essentials of Vaiḍika or Sanātana Dharma, all over the land (as was being attempted to be done by the Central Hindu College, before it merged into the Benares Hindu University, and went under a new management). I said that if this was done, the need for the Shuddhi movement would disappear automatically. But the proposals were not supported. In a paper, sent, at the request of the Secretary, which was read out to the Hindu Maha Sabha Session at Calcutta, in 1939, I repeated these and some other suggestions. The Sabha did not adopt any resolutions, on the subject. But letters, cuttings, pamphlets, received by me, since, indicate that the leaven is now beginning to work—rather late. But—'Better late than never'; and, in cases like these, 'It is never too late to mend'; at least so let us hope.

Swāmi Shradḍhānanda was assassinated by a Muslim fanatic, towards the end of 1926, who, it seems, had become deranged in mind with anger at the Shuddhi movement. It is a 'curious coincidence' that the Swāmi-ji got reprinted, in the earlier months of that same year, J. Von Hammer's *History of the Assassins*, in its English translation by O. C. Wood, which had been long out of print. It should be noted that the Swāmi-ji was a great educationist also. He founded the Gurukula University of Kangri near Hardwar, in 1902, four years after the Central Hindu College was started; and conducted it, as far as possible, on the ancient traditional lines.

f Irān, Irānī; Bengal, Bengal-i; Madras, Madras-i), or Hind-u. In the near western Muslim countries, Indian Muslims are known as Hindi-s. Thus, strictly, 'Hindu' means 'Indian'. It is a geographical word; indicates habitat; not religion; strictly speaking. The use of the word Hind-u, and its current sense, have grown up in the last 700 years or so. The proper ancient name of the Religion is Vēda-Dharma or Vaidika Dharma, 'the Religion of Knowledge, of Spirituo-Material Science', 'Scientific Religion'; also Sanātana Dharma, 'the Religion of the Eternal Spirit, the Supreme Universal Self', therefore 'Eternal Religion'; also Ārya Dharma, 'the Religion of Duty followed by the Virtuous, the Noble-minded'; also Bauddha Dharma 'the Religion of Buddhi or Rational Intelligence, the Rational Religion'. But its best name is Mānava Dharma, 'the Religion of Man, the Child of *Manu* the *Thinker*, of Adi-Manu, Adam', 'the Human, Humane, Humanist Religion.' Another old and commonly used name is Varn-Āshrama-Dharma, 'the Religion of the Duty of the Four Varṇas or Vocational Classes, and of the Four Āshramas or Stages of Life', which includes all Humanity within its purview; which enfolds within the arms of its Universal Psycho-physical Principles of Social Structure, every child of Adam.

So, too, the word 'Islam' means the Religion of 'Peace,' 'Acceptance' of the Will of God, 'Submission to God.' So the word Christianity means the Religion of the 'Christos', the 'Anointed with', 'bathed in', Divine Wisdom. The person who has found the Peace of the Universal Self *within* himself, and therefore endeavours to spread that Peace all round, is the true 'Muslim'. The person who has bathed and purified himself in and by the Divine Wisdom, the Vision of the Universal Self, and therefore endeavours to spread Peace on Earth and good will among men, is the true 'Christian'. The person who has given himself up to the Eternal, the Universal, Self; who has realised the meaning of the Eternal Scientific Humane Religion which embodies Divine Wisdom; he is the true Mānava (Hindu). Thus seen, all three are seen to be the same.

But, everywhere, the Doom of unhappy Man is, that he should follow that perverted meaning of the *letter* which killeth, and not the *spirit*, the real spiritual meaning of even that same letter, which giveth life.

(5) The Muslim religion is a proselytiser, persistent, resourceful, persuasive, also aggressive. It has met with very great success; especially among all the less advanced

peoples, such as those of Africa, and the poorer and more uneducated classes of India, China, South Sea Isles. It met with a rival proselytiser, in the older Christian religion, more redoubtable, equally aggressive during all the centuries that Islam was opposing it with arms, and, latterly, far more wealthy, wide-roaming, far-ranging, science-armed. It has been driven out of Europe, but has met with greater success elsewhere, as just mentioned, because it does not set its moral standards too high for the un-advanced, as Christianity does *theoretically*. It has therefore done much good to the more barbarous peoples of Africa, by stopping 'ceremonial and religious sacrifice' of human beings, and a good deal of fetishism. But it has also been making slaves of them and carrying on an extensive trade in them, until comparatively recently. The same has to be said of Christian Europe too. Hindu India has not, by any means, been free from the practice of 'slavery'. But there is no evidence of any such systematic capture of and trade in slaves.¹

(6) Very much the larger number of the Muslims of India has been, and continues to be, drawn from the 'depressed' or 'untouchable' castes, ignorant, despised, and oppressed by the 'higher' castes; glad to escape from the more complicated and burdensome beliefs and superstitions of Hinduism, into the simpler ones of Muslimism and its freedom from caste tyrannies. Today, probably there is not one Indian Muslim who has no Hindu, male or female, in his or her ancestry.

(7) Occupation for occupation, class for class, rank for rank, ruling prince for ruling prince, man of learning for man of learning, tradesman for tradesman, agriculturist for agriculturist, artisan for artisan, artist for artist, wage-laborer for wage-laborer, landholder for landholder, banker and money-lender and usurer for banker and money-lender and usurer, merchant for merchant, official for official; in respect of wealth, learning, power and authority, virtues and also vices; Indian Muslims are, by no means, worse off than the Hindus; and, latterly, the Hindus have been steadily losing in the competition, because of their manifold degeneracy. But Islamic Law of Inheritance disperses property more quickly than Hindu.

¹For comparison of the work of Christianity and Islam, see G. Higgins' *Apology for Mohamed* (pub. 1829), reprinted (1929) with Introduction, by M. Abul Fazl (Allahabad); see also Sir T. W. Arnold's *The Preaching of Islam*.

(8) In the nearly 1200 years of Muslim invasions of and rule over large parts of India, from the end of the seventh to the middle of the nineteenth century A. C., there have always been independent Hindu kings of other large parts of India; there have been alliances as well as wars between such Hindu rulers and Muslim rulers; as also between Hindu and Hindu, and Muslim and Muslim, rulers; and Hindu and Muslim soldiers have often fought, side by side, against Hindu and Muslim soldiers similarly fighting side by side.

(9) In these 1200 years, the Hindu population of India, which, before that time, was practically 100 p. c., has gradually shrunk to about 65 p. c. This fact may well be interpreted as showing, on the one hand, that conversion has not been possible to any great extent 'by the sword'; but has mostly been achieved by the freedom from caste-tyrannies which Islam held out to the 'lower castes'; and, on the other, that the so-called Hindu 'majority' has never dreamt of oppressing or 'eating up' the Muslim 'minority', as is being incessantly and 'diplomatically' asseverated by the Muslim League. Indeed, Hinduism has actively and powerfully promoted the great progress and expansion of that 'minority' towards 'majority-ship', by its virtue of tolerance towards other religions, and its criminal vice of excessive 'intolerance' towards members of its own fold.¹ While Islam opens out its arms, and invites all and sundry to enter within their embracing circle; Hinduism is always eagerly driving its children away from the family-home, by the process of excommunication.

(10) In such circumstances, 'cow-sacrifice' has come to stay in India; as much as buffalo, goat, sheep, pig, and cock sacrifice. And the degeneration, hypocrisy, and helplessness of Hindus, (combined with the conversion of pasture-lands into cultivated fields, because of increasing revenue-and-rent demands, and the closing of the forests by Forest Laws), has gone to such an extent, that members of the higher castes, who are the most loudly vocal against cow-sacrifice, are often themselves those who, unable to stall-feed them, directly or indirectly sell cows and bullocks to the butchers; for the *daily* meat-supply, in vast quantities, of such Muslims and Europeans, especially British soldiers and others as eat beef; and for the annual Baqr-id sacrifice.

¹The Baluchis are said to have a proverb: 'The Muslim kills his enemy; the Hindu kills his friend'!

(11) This *cow-sacrifice* has been the long-standing chief cause of communal fights between Hindu and Muslim. But these fights were rare; at most, once a year, here and there; formerly. At the same time, there have very seldom been any riots over the daily butchery of cattle, female as well as male, for the food of those who eat them.

(12) Conditions have changed very rapidly since the introduction of the policy of *Separate Electorates*, with extra heavy *Weightage* to Muslims. Other occasions, of *daily* occurrence, have been newly invented, for rioting. Therefore riots have become very much more frequent. This point will be dealt with more fully, later on.

The Tornado-Rush of Modern History. Pain may do what Pleasure could not.

All Human History has been rushing forward with tremendous speed, in these last three decades; in keeping with the marvellous enhancement in the speed of locomotion and communication, by rail, steamship, motor-car, motor-boat, aero-plane, and telegraph, telephone, and radio. The work of centuries is being compressed into years, even months. These wretched Hindu-Muslim wrangles also are copying the process, under pressure of politico-economical conditions. As the European peoples are battering and shattering each other towards a better and more Rational World Order and World Religion; so, it seems, will Hindus and Muslims. Peaceful methods, of Disarmament Conferences, Economic Conferences, Ambassadorial Consultations, Diplomats' *Pour-parlers*, Unity Conferences, have all failed; because *Sincere Philanthropy* was absent from all these efforts. The 'Total Unconscious' which drives Humanity upwards, has therefore adopted Painful ones.

Opposite Half-Truths.

Some say Hindus only are to blame; some say, Muslims only are the aggressors. Some say, that Hindus and Muslims are not to blame, the British Government only is to blame; others say, the British Government is not to blame, the Hindus and Muslims are to blame. Some say, there will be no Swaraj without Hindu-Muslim Unity; others, there will be no Hindu-Muslim Unity without Swaraj. Some say there is no religious sentiment really involved in these fights, but only economics and political crumbs, posts, privileges, preferences, electoral seats; others say, the religious sentiments are the main thing, the others are secondary; for otherwise it would have been a quarrel between Hindu *and* Muslim 'haves' on the one side,

and Hindu *and* Muslim 'have-nots' on the other ; not Hindu 'haves' *and* 'have-nots' on the one side, and Muslim 'haves' *and* 'have-nots' on the other. Some say, the Germans only are to blame ; others say, the British only are to blame. Some say, Non-Violence must become universal first, Economic Equitability will follow ; others say, Economic Equitability must be established all over the world first ; Violence will disappear of itself. Some say, Rational World Order, Equitable Distribution of Goods, must come first, and World Religion will follow ; some say World Religion must come first, and World Order will follow. All agree in saying one thing, viz., 'The *other fellow* only is to blame, *not I* by any means' ! It is all as if some said, the seed comes first and the fruit follows ; and others said, the fruit comes first and the seed follows. Each is a half-truth. The whole truth is that *each is included in the other* ; because of the Meta-physical Law and Fact, that 'Each includes All', or 'All is in Each', or 'All is in All', 'Everything is Everywhere and Always'. In Arabic Sufism, *Indirāj-i-Kul-f-il-Kul*. In Indian Vedānta, *Sarvam Sarvaśra Sarvaṁ*. In Modern Science, the Atom is in a World, and a World is in each Atom ; the Infinite is in each Infinitesimal, and each Infinitesimal is in the Infinite. Put the two opposite half-truths together, and you have the whole truth. Instead of all agreeing in laying the whole blame on 'the other fellow', let us all agree in saying : 'The fault lies primarily with me, and secondarily with the other fellow'.

The Whole Truth.

World Order and World Religion, Non-Violence and Social Justice, Peace between the Creeds and Peace between Appetite-Needs, are inter-dependent. They should be worked for, and will arise, simultaneously. Hindu leaders are to blame ; Muslim leaders are to blame ; the Government is to blame—all at the same time. So are British and German and American and other warring nations. A Hindu, like the present writer, ought to say, and does say, that the Custodians of the Hindu Religion are *most* to blame ; the Custodians of the Muslim Religion in the *next* degree ; that the Government is *very much* to blame, for utilising these dissensions, for its own unrighteous purposes, instead of allaying them ; as an honest Government, which is not a 'Government' but an 'Ad-ministration', a genuine Public 'Servant', which has no other interests at heart than the interests of the People, *ought* to allay,

and *can* allay¹. The riots would *not* have gone on increasing in numbers and violence since 1919-20, if the Government had dealt with the Custodians of Both Religions wisely, honestly, and strongly, and had helped to spread the teaching of the Common Essentials of All Religions in the Schools and Colleges.

Religious Sentiments and Earthly Appetites are both involved, in these riots, as in the World War. The human being has his head in the air and his feet in the mire ; his eyes now roam the stars, now scan the muddy path. Both heaven and earth, both mind and body, both poetry and bread, both songs and clothes, both ideals and reals, are needed. In satisfying this dual need, a People and their Ad-ministra-tion, which are sincerely one in head, heart, interest, aims of life, would find it an ever-growing delight to co-operate. When they are not thus united, they can only, and do, make life more and more troublesome for each other.

True; and Truer.

Mahatma Gandhi's statement has been quoted above, that "Communal Divisions" constitute one of "the four pillars" built up by the British to support and maintain their Government over India ; that the Nationalists are not responsible for them ; and that "the more they try to deal with them, the firmer they must become". But another article in his weekly, *Harijan*, of the same date, 18. 2. 1940, closed with the sentence : "What does matter is *our own weakness*, for which *we alone should be to blame*". The

¹ Herbert Spencer's *Study of Sociology* is a classic on the various kinds of *biases*. But a more vivid and brief description may be read in the last chapter of G. B. Shaw's *Guide to Socialism*. He shows how the selfish 'economic bias' subtly makes the most benevolent doctor wish to prolong his patient's illness ; the most affectionate lawyer to encourage his client in litigation ; the most philanthropic priest, to preach false doctrines ; the most generous tradesman, to overcharge ; and so on. A Government, made up of salaried officials, eager for self-aggrandisement, self-importance, self-perpetuation, self-multiplication, instinctively fosters disorder, in order to have more and more opportunity of making a show of restoring order ; the more so, when it has to serve the interests of the 'governing classes' of another country.

former statement, regarding the British, is *true* ; but the latter, regarding our own fault, is *truer*.

Mahatma Gandhi's Programme—Why Sterilised ?

Mahatma Gandhi's Fourfold Programme is all very excellent. More on it may be said later, in this book. Here, it is enough to say that the lack of a Fifth Item, more important than all the four, indeed inclusive of them all, has sterilised and nullified them. That Fifth Item is a Reasonable Scheme of Swaraj, including provision for suitable Culturo-Vocational Education for all ; Education which would emphasise the fourth R, Universal Spiritual Religion, first and foremost, as the very essence of Culture, and would stress and impart Vocational Instruction and Training, suited to each temperament, side by side with it.

M. Gandhi has said, "the Muslim League blocks the way". It does, quite obviously. Its present President has put forward 'fourteen points', in imitation of President Wilson, and the cry for a separate Pakistan, in admitted imitation of Herr Hitler's claim and action regarding Sudetenland. But the fatal lack in the Congress Programme prevents the Congress from breaking through the Muslim League's 'blockade' successfully.

The Muslim League's Great Chance ; and Great Failure.

The sad pity of it all is that the Muslim League leaders are not doing any better, are doing even worse than, those whom they are condemning. The M. League leaders have a great chance of really scoring over the Congress leaders and the Hindu Maha Sabha leaders in a grand way ; of winning deep inner joy as well as lasting good fame ; of receiving enthusiastic praise and thanks from Indian Public Opinion and World Opinion ; of showing that Wisdom which is Reasoned Knowledge plus Active Philanthropy ; of shaming the Congress and the Hindu Maha Sabha into grateful acknowledgment that they, the leaders of the Muslim League, are also the best leaders of the Congress and the Hindus and all the Indian People. They have only to put forward a Comprehensive and Constructive Scheme of Self-government, which, by its eminent Sanity, Rationality, just Protection of all Right Interests of all Creeds and Classes, would win ready adherence and applause from all, Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Sikhs, Jains, Parsis, Buddhists, alike.

But they are throwing away that great chance. They are failing to rise at all to the great occasion. They are contenting themselves with meaningless catchwords, 'Muslim

rights', 'Muslim culture', (as are the Hindu Sabha leaders with 'Hindu rights', 'Hindu culture', and the Congress leaders with 'Freedom' 'Independence'); with the petty, paltry, pleasure and excitement of tasting 'leadership', (as are doing many of the others); taking to themselves the coarse satisfaction of having 'successfully obstructed the other fellow'; and they are earning a bad name thereby. It is very *good* that the leaders of the Congress, the Muslim League, the Hindu Maha Sabha, the Rulers of Britain and of Germany, should 'wake up' their followers, their 'subjects' or 'citizens'. But it is very *bad* that the 'waking up' should end in challenges and counter-challenges, in conflicts and murderous wars. The Waking Up would be *truly good, only if* it leads to mutual consultation and Co-operation for a New World Order, seeking the Good of *All*.

Non-Leaguer Muslim Opinion and Impartial British Opinion re Pakistan.

We have quoted before, the Punjab Premier Sir Sikandar Hyat Khan's dissent from the Pakistan Cry, (see p. 174, *supra*). Speaking again, on 11. 3. 1941, in the Punjab Legislative Assembly, he said: "If Pakistan meant that there would be pure Muslim Rāj in the Punjab, he would have nothing to do with it. What he visualised was a free Punjab, in which all communities would share self-government...The Punjab Ministry was not a League Ministry, but it was a Ministry purely of the Punjabis...Let everybody have freedom, but *not freedom to dominate*." The Sind Muslim Premier Mr. Alla Baksh is also reported to be entirely against Pakistan. The Bengal Muslim Premier, Mr. Fazlul Haq is a very variable person, who now runs behind Mr. Jinnah, and now sides with the Krishak Praja Mandal of Bengal, (whose condemnation of the Pakistan Scheme has been quoted before, p. 179, *supra*); he appears to be an opportunist in head, and a nationalist at heart, and himself was, it seems, the head of the Mandal, at one time. He is a *fighter*; but unfortunately, does not seem to hold to any fixed firm principles; no more do many persons of the H. M. Sabha; and the danger of passing from 'no fixed principles' to 'unprincipled', is often great. As to the fourth Muslim-majority province, the N. W. F., its ex-Premier (Congress) Dr. Khan, elder brother of the 'Frontier Gandhi' Khan A. G. Khan (together with whom he has been preaching Satyagraha); and as greatly respected (by official as well as non-official) for his uprightness,

sincerity, charities, outspokenness, patriotic self-sacrifice—Dr. Khan, in the course of a press statement, d/ Peshawar, 23. 4. 1941, issued in order to clear away some misapprehension which seems to have arisen, says: "I wonder how the Nawab could gather the impression that 'although we were ostensibly Congressmen, we favoured the League for all practical purposes'. I believe he made this statement deliberately to mislead the Musalmans of India...I was very clear...when I gave them an idea of what we thought of the Muslim League and its leaders and of the absurd scheme of Pakistan... Our differences with the League...are of vital character...I would prefer death to joining a futile set of people, utterly devoid of action and loud on the stage. What a Pathan wants is action and selfless service in the cause of the country. Where are these to be found in the Muslim League?"

An extract from an editorial of the *New Statesman* (of Britain, reproduced in the *Allahabad Leader*, 24. 4. 1941) puts the whole situation so well that it is reproduced below:—

"Lord Linlithgow selected the Muslim League as the sole spokesman of all the Muslims of India. It is a powerful organisation, and it has in Mr. Jinnah an able and dynamic leader. But it has, or until the other day it had, virtually no following in the provinces where the Muslims are strongest—the Punjab, Sind, and the Frontier Provinces. Less than a quarter of the members elected by Muslim constituencies at the provincial elections belonged to it. It claims that in the recent months it has greatly increased its membership, and this may well be true. Under the *distinguished patronage* of the Viceroy, it has become, after the Congress, the greatest political power in India. We have chosen to *standardise* the *extremist position* of Mr. Jinnah as the *sole Muslim opinion* we recognise. Now between the views of Mr. Jinnah and those of every other Indian party, including those of *other Muslim organisations*, no compromise is possible. Mr. Jinnah denies that there is an Indian nation: for him there are "*two nations*", Muslims and Hindus. He demands their *separation*, and the creation of an independent Muslim *Ulster*. This scheme appears to have *no mass support* behind it in the *main Muslim area* of the North-West. Failing this solution, Mr. Jinnah's demand is for parity with the Hindus, not in rights but in actual power. He will have no truck with democracy, if that means that a Hindu majority can always vote down a Muslim minority.

"Stated in these terms the controversy is insoluble. It is also in our view *unreal*; only *our policy*, in the past, which stressed this *classification of men by creeds*, has caused it to *overshadow every substantial issue* in Indian politics. No one has ever questioned the claims of Muslims to equal rights, civil, political, and cultural; for these the *Hindus offer* every imaginable guarantee. Theirs was *never a persecuting religion*. The recent pose of the Muslim *extremists*, that they are an oppressed minority, is merely *ridiculous*; they govern four provinces and have a share in the government of all the rest. A scholarly Muslim theologian is actually the President of Congress. *In every burning issue* of Indian politics, whether agrarian reform, taxation, or the improvement of the social services, *creed is an irrelevance*: the real divisions lie between peasants, labourers and debtors, and landlords, employers and usurers. It is possible, given good will, to circumvent this feud.

"The pledge to grant Indians the right to determine their own Constitution immediately after the war, should be embodied in a resolution to be passed at once by Parliament. The text of it must satisfy reasonable Indians before publication. It should stipulate that all Indian creeds are entitled to equal rights, but it must arm no minority with a veto.

"In the meanwhile, India through her *national government*, should enjoy all the rights and dignities of a Dominion in determining the policy of the Commonwealth during war and at the settlement.

"Better still, we might confer on her the name and privileges of a Dominion now, leaving to the early future the elaboration of the constitution.¹

"Something of this kind we shall do, if our offer to make India a dominion at the peace was sincere. We shall not do it, *if* we were merely using *Mr. Jinnah as a tool* who will always relieve us from the obligation to fulfil an awkward

¹ This last, in large type, is just the suggestion which the present writer put forward, in a *milder* form, in the *Leader* (Allahabad) dated 16th Oct. 1940, in the first of the articles incorporated in this book. The suggestion has been printed in this book, in large type, on pp. 14-15, *supra*. It meets all the difficulties raised by any party, official or non-official, Government or Public.

pledge. But if we expose ourselves much longer to the suspicion that we are playing the old game of *divide et impera* we shall risk the loss of India at a far from distant future, and in the meantime we shall postpone and cloud our victory in this war."

The only Real Justification of the M. League.

In the meanwhile, the only, but the very strong, justification of the Muslim League's obstructive 'blockade' is, what, so far as this writer is aware, has not been said by any Muslim writer or speaker up to this time. The Muslims *ought* to say: "You Hindus are believers in a system of rigidly hereditary castes, with superiority and inferiority and untouchability, *by mere birth, and birth alone*. This is utterly 'anti-democratic', as well as utterly ir-rational. 'Democratism' is the one 'ism', (even though it be a mere word, with as many interpretations as 'Swaraj'), in which all the other ideologies (Communism and Fascism both), all the other religions, all the other races and nations, and especially we Muslims, are agreed, today. 'Democratism' is the ideal, and idol of us all; we may differ in our practical interpretations; some may hide 'Imperialist Oligarchy' under it, as Britain, U.S.A., France; some, Communist and State-capitalist 'Dictatorship', as Russia; some, Fascist-Nazi and Capitalist 'Dictatorship', as Italy and Germany; but we are all agreed utterly that it does not allow any such *hereditary* superiorities, inferiorities, untouchabilities; any more than it does the exploded 'divine right of kings'. Therefore, we Muslims cannot fraternise, cannot co-operate, with you Hindus. You may go and dwell in your Nā-Pāk-istan with your hereditary 'untouchables', nā-pāks (the 'impure'). We will have our own Pāk-istan ('the land of the pure'). Of course, superiority and inferiority and untouchability are facts, insuperable and unabolishable facts, in Nature; but they attach to high qualifications, low qualifications or disqualifications, or evil qualifications, and to impurity, dirt, vices, infectious and contagious diseases, etc., respectively; they do not attach to any human beings as such, by mere birth. If you Hindus are willing to *regenerate* yourselves, by realising these principles of common-sense as well as science; if you accept, and act according to, Abul Fazl's view of the right kind of social structure, (which view is in complete accord with the rational interpretation of the *Glā-verse*);¹ then, and then

¹ Abul Fazl, the famous minister of Akbar, has written

only, is there a chance of our and your welding together into one Indian People, one nation of 'humans', with common politico-economico-social interests, common electorates, etc., in the spirit of true Democracy, or, rather, Aristo-Homo-cracy; even though we may retain our special creedal private peculiarities, like special tastes, habits, interests; which are not only not harmful, but, within limits, desirable, as giving varied colour to life'.¹

The Muslims as a whole, not only the Muslim Leaguers, have a right to say this; and should say this plainly and clearly, to the Hindu-Sabha-ites, and to all Hindus inside and outside the Congress. If they do so, they will effectively cause that searching of hearts, and stimulating of heads, and cudgelling of brains, (not only among Hindus and their Pandits, but also among Muslims and their Mullas), which will result in the discovery of the One Great Secret of Unity, enshrined, (quite unveiled, for all eyes to see plainly, if they would only turn that way), in the Scriptures of both Religions. All the other Statesmen, Rulers, Dictators, etc., who are now engaged in driving their peoples to the slaughter-houses, could also see the same Secret, in the same place. But all concerned have to turn their eyes in the right direction, and wash them clean of the dust and soot of the pre-conceptions and pre-judices of 'Nationalisms', and 'Creedalisms,' and put on the clear transparent glasses of just, reasonable, scientific interpretation and of 'Humanism'.

The Cawnpore Riots of 1931.

As said before, very serious communal riots have been occurring all over the country since 1920. The Moplah riots of 1920 became 'the Moplah Rebellion', and had to be

in the 'Introduction' (*Muqaddamah*) of his great work, *Āin-i-Akbarī*, that: *Jahāniān az chahār garoh burūn na bāshand*, (1) *ahl-i-qalam*, (2) *mabārizān*, (3) *pēsha-warān wa bāzargānān*, (3) *kishāwarzan wa barza-garān*; i.e., "There is no human being but falls into one or another of these four classes (1) the men of the pen, (2) the warriors, (3) the men of trade and of the market, (4) the men of tillage and labor". The *Gītā*-verses (iii, 13 and xviii, 41) speak of these same four *varṇa*-s as being constituted by natural temperaments.

¹This paragraph is reproduced from the present writer's paper, 'Some Old-time Suggestions for New-time Congress Work', contributed to the Ramgarh Congress Souvenir (1940).

quelled by the military. They lasted for some months. Towards the end of 1921, violent riots broke out in Bombay, in the very seat and under the very eyes of the provincial Government; lasted for some weeks; stopped only after over 50 persons had been killed and over 400 injured. Then there was a veritable epidemic of such, all over the country. Mahatma Gandhi's article and verdict on the subject, in 1924, have been discussed before, (pp. 187-188, *supra*). In September of that year, he imposed on himself and carried out a 21 days' fast, in Delhi, as expiation of the sins of both the communities. A Unity Conference was held in Delhi during the fast. The present writer proposed, at one of its meetings, the appointment of a Committee of learned and at the same time broad-minded and large-hearted representatives of all the great religions, living in India, to draw up a Text-Book of the Common Essentials of all; to be introduced into all Educational Institutions within reach of Congress influence. The proposal was put aside, after very brief consideration. A hundred of the then most prominent Hindu and Muslim leaders signed a joint 'Appeal' to the two communities, which was published broadcast. The riots went on merrily as ever. Early in 1926, there were very serious ones in Calcutta, the capital of Bengal, the seat of the provincial government; lasted nearly two months; resulted in the murder of over a hundred persons; and injuries to very many more. Almost no provincial capital escaped; and many of the other more populous towns imitated. Very serious disturbances occurred in Benares, in February, 1931. Over 40 were murdered; nearly 400 injured; many houses and shops were burnt, broken into, looted.

Much more serious riots occurred in the following March, in Cawnpore. The Annual Congress, then sitting at Karachi, appointed a Committee of 3 Muslims and 3 Hindus, with the present writer as Chairman, to enquire into the causes and suggest remedies. The Committee went all over the town, street by street, made the most careful inquiries it could, for two months, recorded evidence, and drew up a full Report. This Report, on publication, after approval by the All India Congress Committee, was proscribed by the U.P. Government. All copies were seized and confiscated wherever found. Later, in 1938, when the Congress Ministry was in office, in the U. P., the ban was withdrawn; but the Report could not be re-published. It had been found that about 400 persons had been killed, about 1200 injured, about

five lakhs of rupees worth of houses destroyed by fire ; and, (but this figure was left doubtful), some twenty lakhs worth of goods was said to have been destroyed and looted, in and from houses and shops, in the Cawnpore Riots of 1931.

This case is specially mentioned at some length, because it was exceptionally serious : was enquired into in detail on behalf of the Congress ; and the Congress Committee's Report on it, goes fully into the history of Hindu-Muslim relations from the earliest times down to 1931 ; proves by a mass of evidence, drawn from official records, debates in the British Parliament, contemporary writers, and the living witnesses examined, that the policy of *divide et impera* was at work throughout, since the advent of the British rule ; and shows that the two communities had, in the course of centuries, settled down into friendly relations, on the whole, (apart from the battles due to the infernal ambitions of rulers), with much useful division of occupations between the two, much study of each other's literatures, much amalgamation of cultures, much sharing of common festivals and joys and sorrows, much writing in Urdu prose and verse by Hindus, and a fair quantity in Hindi verse of a very high order by Muslims, (so that the poems are read and studied as classics by Hindus), much exchange of skill in the arts of music, painting, architecture, much co-operation and joint partnership in business of various kinds, much treatment of Muslim patients by Hindu Vaidyas and much medication of Hindu patients by Muslim Hakims and especially by Muslim surgeons (jarrāh-s). In the last chapter, the Report made detailed suggestions, classified under several heads, for re-establishing these friendly relations, which have latterly been largely upset by 'policies' and 'politics.'

The first, foremost, and most important of all these suggestions ; which was supported by all the nearly 40 witnesses examined (with one or two exceptions who were doubtful) ; was that the Essentials of all the Religions, which they all said were undoubtedly Common, should be taught to all students in all educational institutions. Another very important suggestion was, that the Congress should put forward a Scheme of a Constitution which would, on its face, bear proof, that all the just interests of all the communities, classes, sections, vocations or occupations, which made up the Indian People, would be equitably satisfied.

The A. I. C. C., as said above, approved of the Report, and ordered its publication; but *took no active steps to implement the suggestions.*

The result is that the riots have gone on breaking out here, there, everywhere, as before. There are 'appeals' galore, for 'Unity'. But they are all utterly hopelessly futile and fatuous, in the absence of specific directions *how* to co-operate and unite.

The Newly Discovered Occasion for Rioting— 'Music before Mosque.'

One important point, noted in the Cawnpore Riots Report, requires particular mention.

Up to 1919, generally speaking, Hindu-Muslim riots used to occur only once a year; on the occasion of Baqr-Īd sacrifice; and these too, only here and there. But now a new occasion was invented; an occasion of daily occurrence; nay, which might occur more than once every day, in every place where a mosque happens to be located on, or close to, any thoroughfare. The new demand was and is that music must not be played near a mosque while *namāz* prayers are being offered within it. Five times are fixed by the Muslim religion, for five daily *namāz*-es; (as *two* are for the Hindu *sandhyā*-s). But five is the minimum. No maximum is laid down. Rather, the theological opinion is that the oftener the *namāz* is repeated, the greater the merit. So, some 'devotee' or other may be at prayer at any time during all the 24 hours. Therefore, no music must be allowed in the vicinity of a mosque at any time of the day. Also, it seems, the Islamic religion discourages, or even forbids, music, painting, etc., generally. Yet some of the greatest and most famous musicians and painters of India, in the last four centuries, have been and are Muslims.

The counter-claim of the Hindus is, that they have been accustomed, since thousands of years before Islam was born or came to India, and any mosques were built here, to go in procession with music, on all sorts of occasions, marriages, religious festivals, ceremonial rituals, and so forth, on all thoroughfares; that even after the construction of the mosques (often with the consent and even the help of Hindus), the music was never interfered with before; that latterly, for some centuries, the players of the music-bands have been themselves Muslims, usually; and that the marriage processions of Muslims them-

selves have also been passing, all along, with such music bands, by the mosques.¹

The consequences have been what were desired and hoped for, by the inventors of the new strategy. Some 'persons of leisure and devoutness' are always 'praying' within each mosque adjoining a public road ; whenever a Hindu procession with music may happen to pass along, (latterly, sometimes even a group of women singing, without any instrumental music), these 'prayers' are 'disturbed'; and their devotion to Islam, (from *Ar. salm*, 'peace,' 'submission'), the 'Religion of Peace and submission to God', as interpreted by these 'devotees', finds expression in a discharge of previously collected brick-bats, pebbles, stones, followed up by a sally, and a riot, and usually a rout of the processionists, who are not provided with 'the munitions of war,' nor even 'the spirit of war.'

True, the music is often the reverse of musical, is mere discordant noise ; the 'religious' occasions for them are mostly 'superstitious,' i.e., without ascertainable relation of cause and effect, are matters of 'faith without reason'; but so are most of the observances of most religions to-day, and all the amusements and enjoyments of children, or for that matter, of grown ups; and the masses of the people have few other amusements available.

On the other side, the 'prayers' within the mosques are often non-existent, and when they are really being offered, the heart is not being opened to God ; but, rather, the ears are being kept open to catch the sounds of any straying music ; and instead of a chance being given to God to enter hearts and

¹The late Maulāna Shaukat Ali said, (so the present writer remembers distinctly), at the Delhi Unity Conference in 1924, that, at his own marriage, in Rampur, the elephant on which he was mounted as bridegroom, was deliberately stopped, together with the whole procession, before the main gate of the chief mosque of the town, and the band played joyously for a whole half-hour, before moving on. It may be noted that the rulers of the Rampur State are Muslim Nawabs, that they have kept up the name Ram-pur, which is pure Samskr̥t, and that some of the preceding Nawabs are said to have been patrons of Samskr̥t learning, and maintained Pandits at their Courts. In those days feelings were kindlier and thoughts wiser.

spread peace, a chance is given to the Adversary of God and the Enemy of Man to enter ears and cause a riot ¹

Thus are weak and childish 'superstition', on the one hand, and strong and aggressive 'superstition', on the other, being given the opportunity of fighting it out, by the *Pax Britannica*.

If the devotees wished to engage in real prayer ; if they, being human, and liable to be disturbed by noisy music, sincerely desired to be free from such disturbance ; and if the minimum number of times for their prayers was definitely fixed ; there would be some good reason for even the very new craving that music be not played near mosques at those times. In such case, a settlement could easily be arrived at amicably, by mutual agreement ; after sober consultation between the more staid, elderly, experienced, dispassionate, peace-loving representatives of both communities. Such settlement would become much easier if the Government and its magistracy and police co-operated genuinely and honestly ; as they would, if they regarded themselves sincerely as 'public-servants', servants and well-wishers of the Public, the People ; if they were anxious to promote peace between all sections of the people ; if they made it their business, as it is plainly their duty, to find out and ascertain who, among the citizens, are the most trustworthy, peace-minded, unselfish as well as experienced ; and if they brought such together, in consultation, to arrange all such matters amicably. The longest-established customs may rightly be changed and replaced by new ones, for sufficient good new reasons, by the consent of all concerned.

Even without any friendly attempt by Muslims, (whose duty it was, clearly, in the circumstances, to make the proposal, first, in a friendly manner, to the Hindus, that the latter's millennia-old custom might be changed), to persuade Hindus to agree willingly to stop music at certain fixed times of the day near mosques ; seeing that the Governmental Executive was, for its own reasons, not inclined to maintain

¹ Maulana Rūm spoke a fine verse, when charged with not imitating exactly the movements of the *imām*, the leader of the prayer, in the mosque :

Ba Ḳhudā, man na ḍānam, chūh namāz mī guzāram,
Ke ṭamām shud rakātē, wa falān shud imāmē.

(By God ! when I am praying, I don't know

Who th'imām, what he does, and when he ends.)

even fully proved long-established custom ; the processions of 'the mild Hindoo' have latterly been generally submitting to the new demands, and stopping music whenever asked to do so. But—'appetites do grow with what they feed upon', and 'give an inch and yield an ell'. Witness the doings of the European powers. When persons are determined to fight, excuses are not far to seek. Esop's fables impress that fact on our minds vividly. Things have grown from bad to worse, and have come to such a pass, that the mere utterance of the words, 'he is a Hindu', 'he is a Muslim', makes heads hot ; as the words, 'he is a Briton', 'he is a German', would, today, where persons of both nationalities happened to be present, (as they might be, and are, in neutral territory).

That some leaders, who, directly or indirectly, are the cause of this state of affairs, have taken a further step, and raised the cry of a completely *separate* and completely autonomous Pakistan, (without any link with the rest of India through any co-ordinating and controlling central authority common to both, it seems)—this we have noted and commented on already.

Another portentous consequence of these new communal agitations, cries, schemes, is, that, since 1921, violent riots have been occurring in a number of the large *Indian States* also, where they had never been heard of, before. They have even spread to *Burma*. Also, where, formerly, the 'electric-lights' used to be switched on *and off*, at the will of 'leaders' and politicians ; now they have acquired a sort of 'independent' existence of their own ; switch themselves on, at their own caprice, and are becoming more and more *difficult to switch off*.

Very serious riots occurred in Sind, in 1937-38, over extensive tracts of country. Many villages destroyed, and a great exodus of Hindus, were reported by the press. The riots of 1931 were repeated in 1939, in Benares and Cawnpore. In Benares there were even more murders, about 60, of Hindus and Muslims both ; and the police had to open fire 42 times, in as many places, before the riots subsided. In Cawnpore they dragged on for some months ; but do not seem to have been so malignant and murderous as those of 1931. Cawnpore is largely a 'new' and rapidly growing 'modern' industrial town of mills and factories. Its population has shot up from less than two to about four lakhs, by the recent Census, within about three decades. There is

much illicit traffic in cocaine and other 'drugs and drinks that work the wit abuse'; and there are many gangs of rowdies, bullies, *goondas*, some composed *jointly* of Hindus as well as Muslims, who make of hooliganism a paying profession.

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerji, speaking at Allahabad, on 27-4. 1941, "described the present conditions in Bengal to be the result of a gigantic Anglo-Muslim conspiracy to keep down the Hindus' rights. He urged that the 28 crores of Hindus should be united by one common bond". But, as usual, he did not specify the bond. We have dwelt on this point before. Every time such a vague cry is raised, that '28 crores of Hindus should unite', it is our duty to ask, 'Will don't-touchist Hereditary Caste-ism form this bond? Has it not *disrupted* Hindus into 3000 castes? We will do nothing to remove the cause of the disease; we will go on fostering it diligently; and we want to be cured completely, by merely crying—one common bond!'

General Smuts' Views.

Incidentally, with reference to Dr. S. P. Mukerji's statement re' "Anglo-Muslim conspiracy", a sentence may be quoted from a speech broadcast by General Smuts, from Capetown, on 26-4-1941: "Britain is investing in friendships; as Germany is investing in hatreds, in the process of the war; and Britain is thus the capital from which the Real New World Order will be floated after peace."

Is Britain 'investing in friendship' in India? Her jails and detention camps are filled with political Satyagrahi prisoners, after trials in which they, as a rule, offer no defence, (having, in fact, notified the local magistrate beforehand of the time and place when they would proclaim and preach conscientious objection to the current 'imperialist war'); and with 'suspects', arrested by the police, without magisterial warrant and specification of crime, and confined and detained, without any trial, for indefinite periods, at the will and pleasure of the Government. Does this constitute 'investing in friendship'? Is not the spirit, the attitude of mind, behind such executive measures, the same in kind as that of Nazis in their treatment of German dissentients from Hitlerian policies; though the actual treatment of the prisoners and detainees may not be so bad as that given by the Nazis to their prisoners, (which, according to the reports available, is even worse than the 'questions of the first, second, third degrees' of the police of most countries).

But, it may be asked, if Hindus complain, are not Muslims satisfied? Is not Britain investing in friendship with them? Not at all. Mr. Jinnah and the Muslim League have repelled all the advances made by the Government, and have rejected offhand all the 'come-into-my-parlour' invitations sent by it for co-operation, in superficial trivial matters. The Muslim League wants 'Independence' as much as the Congress. If, in the Muslim-majority provinces, the Muslim Ministries are holding on, the Government know well that it is for the sake of 'power', and not for the sake of any overflowing inherent affection for the British Government.

And is it true that all the score almost of smaller countries, which have been broken, in these twenty months of war, by the tremendous motions of the vast hurtlings of these two Titans, Britain and Germany, is it true that all of them think that only Nazist Germany is 'investing in hatred', and Imperialist Britain, with her vast appropriations all over the earth, has been 'investing in love' only? Had they thought so, would they not have joined with Britain and France, as soon as these declared war on Hitler, and crushed him at one blow? No, it cannot be said that the blame is all 'one side'. What can be said is that each one of these powers has been guided by selfish considerations of 'power', of 'safety first', of opportunism, and not by sincerity and good will for mankind.

If British rulers would exert themselves honestly to make peace between Hindus and Muslims; would set the Indian People upon their feet; and would give them a fair chance to draw up and agree upon a constitution for the Self-Government of India within a British-Indian Commonwealth; then only would Gen. Smuts assertion be true. He *promises* that "the Real New World Order will be floated after peace, from Britain". Why does he not advise Britain to float it *now*, at once, in India? 'Charity begins at home'. Britain would be setting a splendid example if she floated a Rational New Order in India at once. Perhaps it will be said, 'This is not the right time,' 'The atmosphere is not favourable', 'Such things cannot be done in the middle of a war'. We have seen before, that these are only *evasions*. All sorts of radical changes have been made in Britain itself during these twenty months; (*vide* pp. 105-107, *supra*, re 'Emergency Socialism'). Great Revolutions have taken place *during* wars and as the result of wars. Why not try a Peaceful and Wise Revolution, in the midst of war? *The other belligerent may copy it.*

The Moral Force of Good Example is a greater force than the force of explosives.

Government vs. Administration.

When a Government is less a '*Govern-ment*', and more an '*Ad-ministra-tion*'; when its Ministers are really '*Servants*' of the People, (Lat. *ministerium*, serving), not only in the political but also in the *spiritual* sense, (clergymen are called '*ministers*' by a right instinct); when the higher ranks, and, therefore, by force of example, the lower ranks also, of the Public Services, are true *gentle-men* and *gentle-women*; gentle, but also *firm* in high principles of duty; anxious to help the People, and discharge diligently the '*ministrant*' functions of the State, which are positively '*promotive*' of the '*general welfare*'; then the '*constituent*' functions, which are '*preventive*' of crime, disorder, breaches of the peace, and of evil of all kinds—these constituent functions then become minimised automatically.

The duties of the State towards the People, broadly, are the same as those of parents towards the younger generation, viz., to Teach, Guard, Feed, and Serve.¹ These four main functions cover and include all the other hundreds of departmental details and duties. To Teach, Feed, Serve (Help)—these are the '*promotive*' functions, to be discharged through Educational, Economic, and Industrial Organisations. To Guard from harm of all kinds—this is the '*preventive*' function, to be performed by the Executive (Defensive) Organisation. A People that is rightly educated, properly employed and supplied with suitable livelihood, and efficiently helped, by a benevolent, conscientious, and also wise Administration—such a People produces few evil characters; suffers seldom from breach of peace and order; is generally able to deal with such, summarily, itself, in the exercise of the right of private defence, without having need to invoke the help of the '*guardians of the law*'; and, against aggressors from outside, is eager and competent to help the Defensive Organisation in every way, successfully.

But when the rulers and officials are more desirous to '*govern*' than to '*ad-minister*'; to serve their own personal and private interests than the public's; to '*taste power*', by hindering, hurting, ordering about, domineering, than by

¹See *The Science of the Self*, pp. 226-239, for a full exposition.

helping, protecting, fraternising ; when they enjoy more the exercise of the 'constituent' function than of the 'ministrant' ; and neglect the latter or discharge it in a perverse manner ; then vast Unrest arises in a country, and all sorts of troubles between all sections of the People, on the one hand, and between the People as a whole and the Government on the other.

CHAPTER IX.

Consensus, on What India Wants, and; What the World Wants.

India does *not* want to be severed from Britain ; but *neither* does it want to remain a 'Dependency' of Britain ; *nor* does it want to be cut up into a Hindu-stan and a Muslimi-stan. If the last-mentioned absurdity is entertained even in thought, further and worse absurdities *ad infinitum* will have to be entertained, of scores of *stans*, one for each sect of Muslims ; and hundreds, or rather thousands, more of such *stans*, one for each sect and each caste of Hindus ; besides a number of Jaini-stans, (for Jainas too have a number of sects, two of which, Shvét-āmbaras and Ḍig-ambaras, are as much in perpetual conflict as the Shias and Sunnis of Muslims) ; and Sikhi-stans and Parsi-stans ; and so on and so forth, without end.

Some more thoughts re Pakistan.

A few points more may be noted, to further illustrate the absurdity of the Pākistan cry. Benares, it is well-known, is the Mecca of the Hindus. In Mecca, no non-Muslim is permitted to reside. In Benares, quite a fourth of the population is Muslim. That population, by the latest census (of 1941), is just over a quarter million, (two lakhs and a half). There are, no doubt, quarters of the town which are prevailingly Hindu, or prevailingly Muslim ; but only prevailingly ; not exclusively. Generally speaking, Hindu houses and Muslim houses are scattered and intermingled all over, (see pp. 178-180, *supra*). The case of many of the larger towns is similar. How can such cases be satisfactorily dealt with by Pakistanists ? Vast treks and migrations of great hordes, huge transfers of whole-populations, are not unknown by any means. Rather, they have been frequent, in the case of nomad, semi-nomad, unsettled peoples ; as the indigenous tribes of Africa and America ; the early Scythians, Huns, Mongols and Turks of Asia ; Gauls, Goths, Visigoths, Lombards, etc. of Europe. But the process is less easy for 'settled' peoples. Muhammad Tughlaq transferred the whole population of Delhi, to Tughlaqabad, a thousand miles away in the South ; the consequences, to the

population, were disastrous. Maulanas Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali promoted an exodus of *Mahājirins*, some 35 thousand, from India, to Afghanistan, some 20 years ago, in the days of the Khilāfat agitation; the results were very distressful, to the emigrants. Before our eyes, myriads of Germans, Poles, Czechs, etc., have been transferred from one tract to another, in Europe; and millions of Chinese have moved from the eastern coast-lands of China to the western uplands and hills and mountains; during the current wars. But these transfers have not been 'satisfactory' or convenient to those concerned. They are only cases of 'needs must when the devil drives'. The Pakistanists do not seem to desire such transfers of population, either. 'Islands' of 'extra-territorial rights and jurisdictions', if desired, would have to be hundreds, even thousands. Then, there would always be arising, from time to time, the need for re-adjustments; because, conversions of Hindus to Islam would be taking place, all the time; particularly in the Pakistan blocks, with Muslim majorities and governments. And so on, and so forth—as regards the unpracticability and absurdity of the scheme and the cry. The one redeeming feature of Mr Amery's speech of 22-4-1941, is that he has seen and spoken of this impracticability.

The Better Way—for the Muslim League.

We may repeat here, in another form, what has been said above, at pp. 218-219; that, if the M. League leaders, instead of worse than wasting their talents and energies on mere baneful 'Pākistan'-cries, (as the European belligerents are, on 'Crush-the-Enemy'-cries); would only tell the world, *How they would make every inhabitant of Pakistan, 'healthy, wealthy, and wise,'* (physically, economically, morally and intellectually); there would at once occur a cataract, an avalanche, of Public Opinion in their favour; if their Scheme was at all reasonable. Indeed, heaps of Hindus, and, for that matter, Christians and Buddhists and others also, would eagerly embrace Islam, if the M. League thought it necessary to make it a condition that only Muslims would be allowed to enter such a Paradisiac Pakistan. Pakistan 'for the sake of Pākistan'—would obviously be senseless; as the current War 'for the sake of Victory over the Enemy' is. Pākistan 'for the sake of making every citizen of it, healthy, wealthy, and wise, in such and such an easily understandable and convincing manner—would be eminently sane, rational, laudable; as would be the current warring of that Belligerent who

would have the good sense and honest heart to specify his *Peace-Aims*, his intended New World Order, in a similarly intelligible and convincing manner. Surely, War for the sake of War; War for the sake of Victory; for the sake of 'La Gloire'; for the sake of robbing, enslaving, exploiting—is a hateful bestial Monstrosity, to all civilised thinking. Pākistan for the sake of Pākistan would be no different.

Even from the very low viewpoint of theological proselytising tactics, the work of conversion to Islam, from degenerate Hinduism, can be carried on more efficiently throughout Hindustan without a Pākistan; than with a Pākistan it would be outside Pākistan.

The Evil of Separatism.

The Sufis say that God once rebuked Moses :

Tū barāyē wasl kardān āmađī ;

Nai barāyē fasl karđan āmađī.

(Thou wast sent out to tie souls unto Me

And to each other ; *not* to separate

Them from each other, and, therefore, from Me).

The foolish Hindus are patently suffering the consequences of their grievous sin of caste-*Separatism* ; as are the European peoples, of their nation-*Separatism* and rich-and-poor-*Separatism*. The M. League, with its Pākistan-cry is only adding to the strength of that very Evil Force of Darkness, viz., *Separatism*. May God have mercy on all these Demented Ones, and give them the sane mind which would enable them to see and tread the Straight Path of Rational World Order and Spiritual World Religion.

The microbe of *Separatism*, fissiparousness, once provided with congenial soil, will proliferate infinitely, and *dis-integrate* Humanity ; will ruin all the work of the Zeit-geist, which is working for the higher and higher Integration of Humanity into the World Federation that the World-Heart is yearning for.

Germanism and Britonism, Frenchism and Italianism, Russianism and Scandinavianism, Greekism and the score of national-isms of the Balkans—are already making havoc of European humanity. The complete severance of India and Britain would be a further and fatal blow to that Federation of East and West which is indispensable for World Federation ; for that New World Order, the Cause of which is gaining strength more and more every day in the World-Mind. But the continued 'Dependency' of India is as great an obstacle in the way of that World Federation.

A comfortable 'private arrangement', a 'gentlemen's understanding', between the rulers of the 'white' nations; to 'peacefully' divide up all the 'colored' peoples, 'spheres of influence', 'protectorates', 'mandates issued to each other'; and to hold down these 'colored' peoples by force of 'scientific' weapons; an 'understanding' to constitute such a New World Order, to be established 'after this current war has been won'—hope of any such is merest mirage. The nature of the mirage appears at once as soon as the question is asked, 'Won by whom?' "God will not be mocked." *Without* a previous clarification of War-and-Peace-Aims; if the war is won by Britain, the 'New World Order' will be of one sort; if by Germany, of a very different sort. Because the Order will not be an Order of any sort at all; but only a partition of the lands and seas between the victor and allies; and a practical extinction of the vanquished, or reduction to slavery; as of the populations of conquered cities in 'the Glory that was Greece'. More: by indefeasible psychological law, such a partition will *never* be honest and just as between the victorious powers and allies themselves too; and jealousies, hates, wars, will be repeated again; as after 1918. *With* such previous clarification, if the Aims are at all *honest* and promotive of the "General Welfare" of all Mankind, (as, for very shame, they would have to be, in order to bear publication), *there would be no need to continue the War at all.*

Therefore, 'Honesty is the Best Policy'; 'Hatred ceaseth not by Hatred; but by Love'. Therefore, MAKE PEACE, NOW, AT ONCE, AND DO NOT WISH FOR AND WAIT FOR VICTORY'. Make Peace between Britain and India; and Peace between Britain and Germany; simultaneously.

President Roosevelt's Very Important Pronouncement.

In a speech broadcast throughout the world in 14 languages, on 15-3-1941, (*H. Times*, 17-3-1841), President Roosevelt said: "We know that although *Russian autocracy* was bad enough, Nazism is far worse. The Nazi forces are *not* seeking mere *modifications* in *Colonial* maps or minor *European boundaries*. They openly seek the *destruction* of all *Elective* Systems of government in every continent, *including our own*. They seek to establish systems of government on the regimentation of all human beings by a handful of individual rulers, who seized power by force. These men and their hypnotised followers call this a New Order. But it is *not new*, and it is *not an Order*. Humanity will never *permanently* accept a

system imposed by conquest and based on slavery. The nations of Europe and the U.S. did not previously appreciate that these modern tyrants find it necessary to eliminate all Democracies. But we do now. The process of elimination of European nations, proceeded by plan through 1939 and 1940, until the schedule was shot to pieces by the unbeatable defenders of Britain."

President Roosevelt concluded: "We believe that the rallying cry of the dictators and their boasting about the *Master Race* will prove to be pure stuff and nonsense. *There has never been and never will be any race of people fit to serve as masters over their fellowmen.* The world has no use for any nation which, because of its size and military might, asserts the right to goose-step to world-power over other nations and other races. We believe that any nationality, no matter how small, has the inherent right to its own nationhood."

This is a very important statement by the Head of the Wealthiest State of today. It is so, because of certain implicit admissions, and also certain doubtful assumptions, in the first part of it; all which have a bearing on the bringing about of Peace between the belligerents; and it is particularly important because of the very Great Truth enunciated in its second part; which Truth, if duly stressed in the right quarters, would directly and powerfully promote such Peace.

What has been said earlier in this book, regarding pre-war relations between Britain and Germany, and negotiations between British and German statesmen¹, indicates the questionable assumptions. Here it need only be pointed out that, Pt. Roosevelt, in his first sentence, implicitly acknowledges that if Germany desired only "modifications in Colonial maps or minor European boundaries"; in other words, revision of Versailles; then U.S.A. would regard that desire as justifiable, and would have no ground for intervening. Now, if this be so, then, (in the absence of clear proof that Hitler had other, unjustifiable and vicious, desires and ambitions

¹Ch. vii, 'Foreign Policy of *Mein Kampf*,' of E. O. Lorimer's *What Hitler Wants*, does show a hateful 'racialism' in Hitler's mind, more extremist than that of other white races; chs. v and vi outline on 'internal policy' not so unreasonable.

all along), much of the succeeding statements of Pt. Roosevelt look like putting the effect before the cause. This is necessary to invite attention to, because, unless both belligerents recognise and admit their respective sins, Peace is not possible.

As to whether Germany can ever invade U.S.A. at all, when she has not been able to invade Britain (Hitler has expressly admitted the "geographical" advantage of Britain as the cause of his failure)—this is asserted to be impossible, by the 'isolationists'.¹ A controversy seems to be going on, on the subject, in the U.S.A. itself. Pt. Roosevelt too, in his Message to Congress on 6. 1. 1941, expressed the view that, "Even if there were no British Navy, it is not probable that any enemy would be stupid enough to attack us by landing troops across thousands of miles of ocean, until it had acquired strategic bases for operation". But war-conditions may well have changed since then. Pt. Roosevelt said, in his speech of 15. 3. 1941, that "...the U.S. did not previously appreciate...but we do now". Occupying the elevated position he does, he can survey the movements of nations much more quickly and fully than others not so situated; and has, at his command, sources and supplies of information not available to ordinary private citizens.

But however this may be, whether U.S.A. is or is not vulnerable to German invasion, (—we fervently hope she is not—), Indians heartily welcome the declaration by Pt. Roosevelt and other leading statesmen of U.S.A. that "they will not allow Britain to go down in this war". All Indians will earnestly say 'Amen' to this wish and determination of the U.S.A.

It would be a great World Calamity if Britain went down altogether before Germany. For this reason. There is *no certainty, no guarantee*, that Germany would stop short with "modifications in Colonial maps or minor European boundaries". From what has been said, on earlier pages of this book (e.g. pp. 102-107), it may appear that Hitler was willing, at one time, before this war began, to give guarantees²; but the

¹See pp. 49-50, *supra*. A more recent and strong statement of the 'isolationist' view is contained in an article, 'Can Hitler invade America?' by John T. Flynn, in *The Reader's Digest* (New York), for April, 1941.

²It may be noted that Hitler's *Peace Aims*, i.e., the Structure of Society which National Socialism desires, *have*

British and French Governments of Messrs. Chamberlain and Daladier were not willing to take them, and plunged the world into war. But, though the future historian may have to lay the blame at the doors of the British and the French Governments, also, for this catastrophe; yet, now, as a fact, there is no certainty and guarantee, that Germany, were she to obtain any overwhelming victory over Britain, would not become far more imperialist than Britain. Triumph maddens. Power corrupts. Absolute power corrupts absolutely. Success goes to the head, worse than strong drink. Evil habits grow from more to more. Germany might say: 'World-dominion is scarcely enough return for all my immense efforts, sacrifices, successes, science, valour; Britain had only one-fourth of the earth's surface; I must have the whole'. That would be a World Calamity. Instances have been described in the *Purāṇas*. They occurred, now and then, in pre-historic times. A single Titan, by excessive prowess, became Mon-arch of the whole world and 'made the earth groan'; until the 'gods' discovered a way to destroy him, in his turn. To ward off such a disaster, it is very desirable, very necessary, that U.S.A. should help Britain. For, without such help, Britain cannot keep standing; as has been openly declared by Britain's states-men and military-men. She has heroic valour, she has science, she has determination, equal to Germany's; but she has not so large a supply of the implements of war; nor enough population to cope with the needs of active battle, as well as of subsidiary war-industries, and of industries for the supply of the necessaries of life, all at once. This is now fully recognised by U.S.A.; hence she is very rightly redoubling her efforts to send all needed supplies to Britain, with the greatest possible expeditionness.

But—for U.S.A. to simply go on helping Britain, *without doing something more*, which is even more necessary, is only to prolong the time, and extend the area, of the war; and therefore of the miseries of all mankind; indefinitely. The reason for thinking so is this. If U.S.A. is supporting Britain; U.S.S.R. seems to be supporting Germany, indirectly if not directly. European writers, British and other, say that U.S.S.R. wishes that this war between 'Powers', which are

been outlined and placed before the world long ago; as the British Government's have never yet been; see E. O. Lorimer's What Hitler Wants, chs. v, vi.

both inimical to the U.S.S.R.'s social-structure-ideology, may continue, till both become thoroughly exhausted and 'Powerless'; so that Russian Socialism or Communism may be imposed on them; and on all the rest of the world; since much of that rest is already in the war, on one side or the other, and the rest is being slowly dragged in.

What is that 'more' which the U.S.A. should do, therefore, to prevent the starvation and bleeding, nigh to death, of the human world? To explain this 'more', let us go back for a while to Pt. Roosevelt's remarks about *the elective system*. We have to point out while Hitler is only thinking, or trying, (if at all) to destroy the elective system; the British regime has actually destroyed the excellent System of 'Elective' 'Panchayat' Local Self-government of Village Communities that existed throughout India, and worked splendidly, till the British came. The methods, forms, formalities, of election, were, of course, different. They were *better*. The election was silent, not noisy; spontaneous, not engineered; voluntary, not forced by 'bosses'. There were no electioneering tricks, tactics, stratagems; no 'graft and boodle', no 'jerrymandering', no 'Tammany', no intimidation, no violence; no coaxing, wheedling, bamboozling; no whirlwind election-campaigns, no demagoguism, stump-oratory, tub-thumping; no hypocritical manifestoes full of false promises; no deceitful propaganda. Instead; persons who had quietly *grown into and won the honor and trust* of the people around, by their upright *honorable lives*, and benevolent, just, *trust-worthy conduct*, for many years, (not by the wagging of glib tongues for a few minutes); such persons were *requested* by the next rank of leading persons in the community, to become 'Panch-es', and bear the burden of the work of the 'Panchayat'¹; not a heavy burden, when the people are not quarrelsome but eagerly co-operant. Even at the centre of the State, the Raja or Maharaja, or, latterly, the Nawāb or Bādshāh, had

¹ *Panch*, in Skt., means five; *pāñch* is the Hindī form of the word. Probably, the original legislative-plus-executive-plus-judiciary of the village community was a 'committee of five elders', one of whom acted as headman, chairman. Out of these, developed the later very elaborate forms described in the *Smṛiti-s*; though the word 'Panch' or 'Panchāyat', or any near correspondent, is not to be found in the available *Smṛiti-s*, the law-and-custom manuals of the Hindus.

his Councillors ; who were more or less similarly 'silently elected' persons of widely recognised wisdom. During the earlier purely Hindu regime, before the 12th century A. C., and for some centuries subsequently too, in the Hindu kingdoms ; when the chapters of the *Smṛiti*s on 'Raja-Dharma', 'the Duty of Kings', 'the Laws of State-Administration', guided that regime and those kingdoms ; the group of Councillors, 'Mantri-s', ('counsel-givers', 'advisers'), of the king, was quite as powerful as the British Cabinet ; and sometimes changed the king, as Edward VIII was changed for George VI ; or dealt with him even more severely, as Charles I and Louis XVI were dealt with, in Britain and France. Because there was no person called the Speaker, wearing a peculiar wig, tie, gown ; no 'de-bates', (*de*, down, and *bateo*, to beat, 'attempts to beat each other down', instead of 'to help and lift each other up'), recorded and printed, in endless volumes ; not a continual grinding out of hundreds upon hundreds of Acts, which only confuse, perplex, and hamper, and are wholly impossible for even very heavily paid professional barristers and judges to master ; therefore, it is not necessary to jump to the conclusion that there was no living legislation in those earlier days. As well argue that those earlier people did not eat or dress, because they did not use fork, spoon, chinaware and glassware, trousers, coats, hats, boots, of the European styles. There *was* the elective system, living legislation, control of the executive, and responsibility to the People—though in different forms. The *Smṛiti*-s lay down rules, in clear words, for all such things. Indeed, the principle of 'election' is not possible to defeat or abolish altogether, anywhere. Where not overt and direct, it works by acquiescence ; and, at bottom, neither one, nor all, nor even very many, can or do rule ; but always a 'few', who have the *support* of the 'many' in one way or another, and are *headed* by a 'one'. This is recognised practically by all schools of political science now. It is the implied *meaning* of all *organisation*, incipient or highly developed.

Even Hitler got himself *elected* President of the Reich ; and keeps up a Parliament ; even though the elections were bogus ; and the Parliament be nominal. Even Mussolini began his regime with a Parliament ; though later, as is the way with despots, abolished it, when he found himself established in power. Even Stalin has found it necessary to

create a Parliament for Russia; though it may be nominal and only registers his decrees: as the Roman Senate did, those of its 'servant', the Emperor and Caesar. No dictator can possibly become such, unless (directly or indirectly) 'elected' such by his supporters, his party, his army. Napoleon, the First Consul, was able to put an imperial crown upon his head, (which he did with his own hands), because he was asked and helped by his supporters and generals and the French people as a whole, by plebiscite, to do so. In any case, there can obviously never be an unbroken succession of such 'self-made dictators.' There may be, there is, such unbroken succession of many 'kings' whose hereditary crowning is 'accepted' and 'acclaimed' by the people; and such acceptance is tantamount to election. So, the de-position of dictators and monarchs who become intolerable tyrants, is also a process of 'e-lection' reversed; it is 'de-lection.'

Any notion of, any implication by, Pt. Roosevelt or another, that Democracy, as worked, e.g., in U.S.A. or Britain, is an *ideal* system—this may well be regarded as a 'disproven assumption.' The phrase, 'Making the World safe for Democracy', originated with Pt. Wilson. Its bitter inversion, 'Making Democracy safe for the World,' was also phrased first in his country, perhaps. How to make Democracy and the World *safe for each other*—this dual desideratum can be fulfilled only by a combined World Religion and World Order, in accord with the Principles of Psychology and Metaphysic embodied in the ancient Social Organisation of India.

India *had* the Elective System, in a finer and truer form than is to be found in the 'Democracies'¹; and it worked well in the past, according to available tradition and history. But there supervened gross corruption and degeneration, in the last few centuries: whence, the heavy punishment of foreign invasions and incursions. The kings became lustful and cruel despots, given over to sensual debaucheries; because the councillors fell under the same temptations of sense, and allowed themselves to become mere tools. The Indian 'Church' and 'State', 'spiritual power' and 'temporal power', 'altar' and 'throne', helped to drag each other down, as well as the people;

¹See Bryce, *Modern Democracies*; G.B. Shaw, *Guide to Socialism*; Ford, *Representative Government*; (quoted in my *Ethico-Psychological Cruz in Political Science*); and other works which describe the evils of 'democratic' elections.

instead of lifting all up. Even then, the Village Panchayats continued. Foreign travellers have recorded that cultivators went on ploughing, while battles were being fought within sight. The hideous days of 'total war' had not dawned. Under the British regime, the Village Panchayats too disappeared. Attempts to restore them, in the new forms of local, taluqa, district, and municipal boards, and of provincial and central legislatures, are not succeeding; because they are not sincere. The boards are always tied to the apron-strings of the local officials, instead of being their guides; and the legislatures are (as described in a Government publication itself), only "debating societies adhering to an omnipotent Executive", like caudal appendages to be wagged at will by that Executive.

Here arises the occasion to turn to the second part of the extract made above from Pt. Roosevelt's speech.

This second part of Pt. Roosevelt's statement is pure gold. But he should impress the Great Truth embodied therein upon the rulers of Britain. He should induce them to see 'that the British race is not fit to be masters over their fellowmen of India'. He should tell them that 'the British Viceroy of India has all the power of *Russian Autocracy* at its highest'—as all the world knows, and British statesmen know most fully. He should make the British nation and its rulers realise that 'Indian nationality, (not small, but comprising one fifth of the earth's human population), has the inherent right to its own nationhood'. He should induce Britain to give to India, genuine Dominion Status, Self-government, the Elective System, within a British-Indian Commonwealth; or better still, an American-British-Indian Commonwealth. And he can easily do this. He has only to say that U.S.A.'s help to Britain is conditional upon Britain's conferring Dominion Status at once upon India. He would, thereby, win a place in History, among the world's very greatest benefactors, and would earn the profound gratitude of all Mankind for all time. For, not only would the Unrest in India vanish; but the Cause of the present European War and the Japano-Chinese War, viz., Imperialistic Rivalry and Ambition, would disappear. In the Truce or Armistice that would.

follow, the Real Rational New World Order, true World-wide Swaraj or Self-Government, of Co-operation between all Nations, would be planned out by a sincere Spiritual as well as Material League of All Nations and All Religions and All Sciences ; the need for which New World Order, every one, (including the actual and active combatants), is now recognising.

American Support for the Suggestion made above.

It would surely be useful to quote the support, for the suggestion made above, of a fellow-countryman of Pt. Roosevelt. *The Reader's Digest* (New York), for Feb., 1941, contains a very noteworthy article by Mr. William Hard, 'Our Next Step toward a Safer World'. Extracts follow. "We overwhelmingly say that Britain is 'the rim of our freedom' and 'the first line of our defence' ; we must and will help Britain. Very well. I enthusiastically agree...Let us follow our policy through. Let us imagine : We have provided Britain with a sufficiency of supplies ; and Britain has won ! Victory ! But then let us ask : *What will Britain do with that victory?...Will her world commitments and activities, this time, be any more productive of Peace for the World, and for us, than they were last time?...Have we any binding understanding with Britain on these points ? None at all.* The victory will have been won with our resources, but it will be a British victory... We ought not to be asking ourselves simply : 'What can we do to help Britain ?' We ought to be asking ourselves, and primarily : 'What can Britain do to help us ?'...We ought to *bind Britain to make a peace which will produce an invincible American-British zone of World Safety.*" Then the article goes on to suggest "four necessary points in the bargain." Of these, the following are the more important for our purpose : "Let Britain bind herself to cease from blowing hot, blowing lukewarm, blowing cold, on the subject of Japan and China. No more speeches by British ambassadors in the Orient, saying that the ultimate objectives of *Britain and Japan* in the Orient are after all *the same*...Britain and the British Dominions and Colonies and Possessions, and the United States, shall *co-operate toward fairer and fuller trade in the world*...The first end (of such co-operation would be) the removal of one of the main aggravations of belligerency on this planet, viz., *trade discriminations by countries having colonial empires against countries not having colonial empires.* We

Americans in our small colonies have been guilty on this point, on a tiny scale. Britain and the British Dominions, Colonies, and Possessions, have been guilty on a gigantic scale. The fact is recognised by the best British opinion. Britain shall therefore engage to follow, hereafter, the policy recently laid down by the National Executive of the British Labor Party: *'The redistribution of colonial territories between rival imperialisms is no solution. What is needed is a finish to all imperialistic exploitation. There must be equal opportunity of access for all peaceful peoples to markets and raw materials in colonial territories'...*¹...*"From 1919 to 1933, Britain failed to give democratic Germany the support that would have enabled it to remain a democracy. From 1933 onward, Britain failed to give Hitler's Germany the prompt and easy repressions that would have prevented it from rearming itself into a military menace. Britain has proved herself to be as incapable of operating the European continent as we ourselves". In other words, having driven a tiger into madness, why should Britain complain if the tiger attacks her? But even though Britain be to blame, doubly ; now that the maddened German tiger has broken loose, it is necessary to restrain it; and it is also necessary that the British lion should cease from continuing its old world-wide depredations. The article therefore finely concludes : "Under such conditions, the struggle that Britain is now waging, with a heroism to which any tribute is almost an insult, a heroism so high that it is laughter for the participants and tears for the beholders, becomes our struggle too...We have a stake in it, a valid American stake...Then let us state our stake and bind Britain to it...and go all out for Britain with all we have...We shall be going out for all the Americas ..and be starting the creation of a truly invulnerable American system."*

The only comment that need be made on this is, that, so far as mere sheer fighting heroism, and dogged determination in the midst of ruin, are concerned, the highest meed of praise is due to Briton and German alike ; as, indeed, they have been giving it to each other, now and then, like the chivalrous knights of old ; and that, in the last sentences, the word

¹This passage does not occur, somehow, in the Declaration of Policy which forms the Appendix of Mr. H. Dalton's *Hitler's War* ; but there are other, and even stronger, passages to the same effect ; see pp. 118-119, *supra*.

'World' should have been written, instead of the words 'American' and 'Americas'.

The Way to Meet the Requirements of all.

The very wise and practical suggestion, for the simultaneous solution of the British-Indian and Hindu-Muslim problem, of the *New Statesman* (of Britain), has been quoted above, (p. 221, *supra*). It has also been said there that the suggestion made in this book, (at pp. 14-15, *supra*), is the very same; in a slightly milder form perhaps; and so worded as to meet all requirements and conditions put forward by all parties, including the British Government. The suggestion may be repeated here:

Let the British Government, through its Parliament, declare forthwith (1) that India is given, now, at once, Swaraj, such as that of the Dominions under the Statute of Westminster; (2) that the Indian People should proceed, making their own arrangements for it, without asking the British Government of India for any help, except that of maintenance of peace as usual, (and also without any hindrance from it, direct or indirect), to call together their Constituent Assembly, and draw up their Constitution in conformity with that Statute; (3) that the Executive Administration of India will be carried on just as at present, until the new Constitution is formulated and agreed upon by that Constituent Assembly; and (4) that as soon as the Constitution is completely formulated and agreed upon, so soon will the existing Executive Administration change itself into an Administration in accord with that new Constitution.

Clause (1) ensures that India will remain within a British-Indian Commonwealth, in the same way as the other Dominions; (2) ensures that Hindus and Muslims, and not only these, but also all other religious communities and political parties, shall come to an agreement among themselves, before there is any radical change in the Executive Administration of India; (3) ensures that there shall be no immediate sudden disturbance in the Administrative arrangements during the

pendency of the war; (4) ensures that the needed change will be made thereafter. In this way, (a) the *innermost* desire of *all* the communities and parties, for the maintenance of the British connection; (b) the oft-repeated requirement, by the British Government, of Hindu-Muslim agreement; (c) the wish of the British Government to be allowed to go on in their own way while the war is on; (d) the requirement of the Congress, (vide pp. 22-28, 33-35, *supra*), that the British Government must give *active proofs* of *good intention*, and not try to put off with *mere and vague promises*; (e) even Hitler's condition for peace, viz., that Britain should restore freedom to India, (see p. 16, *supra*); (f) the Hindu Maha Sabha's and the Muslim League's requirement that the Hindus' and the Muslims' special rights, (whatever they may be, if there are any), shall be safeguarded—all such requirements, conditions, desires, are met by this suggestion.

Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Amery.

In this reference, it seems desirable to make some quotations from an important press statement issued by M. Gandhi, on 25. 4. 1941, (*Leader*, 27. 4. 1941). In it, he very strongly condemns a speech made by Mr. Amery, Secretary of State for India, on 22. 4. 1941, in the course of a debate on India, in the House of Commons. Un-official M. P.'s, of almost all shades of opinion, even Conservatives, seem to have pressed the claims of India, and expressed dissatisfaction at Mr. Amery's attitude, and his continued harping upon Hindu-Muslim agreement as pre-requisite; the non-official Labor M. P.'s very strongly.

Mahatma Gandhi says :

"I have repeatedly shown that it has been the traditional policy of Great Britain to prevent parties from uniting. 'Divide and rule' has been Great Britain's proud and ill-concealed motto...It is British statesmen who are responsible for division in India's ranks; and divisions will continue so long as the British sword holds India under bondage."

He refers to the riots of Dacca and Ahmedabad; and says British rule has left the Indian people "so emasculated as to disable them from standing up against a few hundred *goondas*." He goes on :

"*Leaving aside the Congress non-violence for the time*

*being*¹, if India had been equipped and trained for *self-defence*, and if India had become a voluntary ally of Great Britain, I hold that all the European powers combined for destruction would not have touched India...The first act of any Government worth its name, would be to teach its people the art of *self-defence*; but the foreign British Government had no concern about this *fundamental welfare* of India's citizens, and it deprived the people of arms." So far, every Indian will agree with him entirely; the present writer would only add *that freedom to possess arms, and training in the art of self-defence, is valuable only when safeguarded simultaneously by a nation-wide Organisation for RIGHT EDUCATION of the People*, and consequent high level of civic morals.

Far from '*teaching* the art of self-defence', the British Government has always been making it difficult, almost impossible, for the orderly-minded citizens to *learn* it by their own private arrangements. See pp. 165, 202, *supra*. Anything at all resembling, even distantly, military drill and discipline, in educational institutions or private associations, is forbidden by that Government; except under strict limitations and Government control and supervision. In times of disturbance, riots, increase of robberies and dacoities, when weapons for self-defence are more urgently needed by the honest citizen, even lathis (sticks, cudgels) are forbidden, and the prohibitory sections of the Criminal Law are used in a manner which hampers the good citizens much more than the bad. The disorderly roughs and rowdies, the bullies and goondas, hooligans and sundowners, apaches, sandbaggers and night-prowlers, rustlers, robbers and dacoits—these *make themselves exempt* from the Arms Act, effectively, at will; not unoften with the connivance of the worse elements in the Police; while the honest citizen is tied hand and foot by it, and placed at the mercy of the criminals. The low level of morality, in the Indian Police, is readily ascertainable from the Official Reports themselves. The reason is that the higher ranks of the services have failed to create, by precept and example, that high tradition which governs, e. g., the London

¹These words are important to bear in mind, with regard to M. Gandhi's profession of the Creed of Non-Violence; profession of it without any qualifications, limitations, reservations, as a *Religious* Creed and Principle. On this subject, more may be said later on.

Police. When even the London Police, justly famous for its integrity, has its scandals, from time to time; which are hushed up for the sake of its reputation; it is no wonder that the Indian Police, with more power, more temptations and opportunities, less check, should be such a failure as it is. The morality of the general public, from which the police is recruited, has also been so polluted, by political and communal mis-administration, mis-leading, mis-education; that public opinion has no moral force left, to act as a check upon official wrong-doing. The old, old Vicious Circle, which breaks itself in a Crash, after whirling too giddily.

The plain and simple reason why a 'foreign' Government 'emasculates' the people is, that it wants them to be 'dependent' upon *it*, for *everything*; bye and bye for even water, light, air, through power-worked systems of water-works, lighting, fanning and ventilation, etc.; *not* in-dependent, or rather *self*-dependent. The British Government has been calling India a 'Dependency'; and does not sincerely wish it yet to become anything else. Capacity for *self*-defence means *self*-reliance, which means *Self*-dependence, (a true word, far better than the meaningless word '*In*-dependence'). Such *Self*-dependence of India is compatible only with a sincere *British-Indian Commonwealth*; *not* with *British Empire*; *not* with British Imperialist strangle-hold upon and exploitation of India.

But when M. Gandhi goes on to say: "I *promise* that Congress, M. League, and all other parties, will find it to their interest to come together and devise a home-made solution for the Government of India, *if* the British withdraw from India", and "*if we agree* not to invite the assistance of any outside power", etc., he is far from convincing. He hedges his 'promise' in, with very difficult 'ifs', as usual with him; worse than Mr. Amery's. He seems to forget that the divisions between Hindus and Muslims, and the causes of those divisions, existed *before* the British came in; facilitated, nay, made possible, that coming in; have been only newly fanned into flame by the British regime, where they were dying down into embers or even smouldering cinders; and that the root-cause of these divisions is, primarily, the debasement of Hinduism by the Pandits, and, secondarily, the vitiation of Islam by the Mullas. His further careful guarding of his 'promise' by the words "all parties will find it to their interest," and the belief implied thereby, seem to over-look astonishingly, the glaring fact

that 'all the parties, i.e., the nations, of Europe,' very much 'cleverer' though they are than 'all the parties' of India, are 'not finding it to their interest' to behave like *sane* human beings; but are trying, *insanely*, before our eyes, to exterminate each other, might and main. The lesson of the recent Spanish Civil War, and of the Japanese war on China, is the same. M. Gandhi's expression of belief that, even if we "have to fight among ourselves...the duration (of the fight) will last perhaps a fortnight," because "we are unarmed," is also shown to be much too confident, by the fact that cold steel and more primitive weapons are easily manufactured and found; and that, in any case, bludgeons, brickbats, stones, are not far to seek, and fire is easily available to incendiaries. These last, and big knives, are the weapons that have been employed in all these communal riots; many of which have resulted in 'casualties' and destruction of property, as great as those of small battles. In these riots, cudgels have been the weapons, mostly, of the Hindus; knives and pointed and edged irons of sorts, mostly, of the Muslims; brickbats, stones, fire, of both. 'If' being "un-armed" were helpful, riots would not occur at all.

The one lesson of current history; as well as of past history, e.g., that of the four long centuries of the Dark Ages of Europe, from 400 to 800 A.D.; particularly of Britain, after the Romans had 'withdrawn' from Britain, as M. Gandhi suggests that the British should 'withdraw' from India; the one lesson of it all is, that *Right Education of the Public*, in *Right Religion* and *Right World Order*, is *the one pre-requisite* of all decent, sane, rational Life, Evolution, Peaceful Revolution; and that without it, Savagery and Barbarism, Bloody Wars and Revolutions, are unavoidable; as in Europe, continuously, since 1914.

'If' M. Gandhi would carefully go into the causes which have brought about the extraordinary increase of the Muslim population, in Bengal, Punjab, Kashmir, Sind, parts of Malabar, into 'majorities'; he would see that the main cause was the excessive egotism, self-righteousness, 'don't-touch-ism', of the Pandits, the 'Custodians of Dharma-Religion', 'Dharm-ādhikāris'. They, and their 'faithfuls', who have been hypnotised by them, as simple-minded children are by their elder's re-iterations and conduct; these have been incessantly driving out of the Hindu fold, by excommunication, on the most absurd and false grounds, on the most trumpery and malicious accusations, all sorts of innocent people; into the

Muslim fold very largely ; and the Christian fold, to a much smaller extent.¹

¹Tradition says that Sultan Sikandar (1386-1410A.D.), ruler of Kashmir, was descended from a minister who had killed the Hindu king, usurped the throne, and become a convert to Islam. Sikandar wished to become a Hindu. The Pandits refused to 'purify' him. They said, 'a Hindu must be *born* such ; none can be *made* one'. He became a very angry and very fanatic Muslim ; in the words of V.A.Smith, (*The Oxford History of India*, p. 272), "a gloomy, ferocious bigot ; and his zeal in destroying temples and idols was so intense that he is remembered as the Idol-breaker ; he freely used the sword to propagate Islam and succeeded in forcing the bulk of the population to conform outwardly to the Muslim religion". It was the Pandits who drove him to this ; according to the tradition current in Punjab and Kashmir ; though Smith and other historians have not recorded it. The present writer heard it from the late Mahatma Hansraj, the aged and highly honored Principal of the D.A.V. College of Lahore.

A similar tradition (which this writer heard from Acharya Sir P. C. Ray, deeply revered patriot and self-denying ex-Professor of Chemistry in the Calcutta University, and now Head of the Palit Institute of Science), centres round the Bengali Brahmana, Raj Narayana Sharma. He was excommunicated by his eastemen, on some frivolous pretext, of consorting and eating with Musalmans, (as he was employed at the court of the then Afghan King of Bengal, Daud Khan) ; became a formal convert to Islam ; rose to be general of the army of Daud Khan ; and behaved like Sultan Sikandar Shah. Daud Khan rebelled against Akbar and was defeated and killed in 1576 A. C. Traditions may not be very accurate ; but which 'professional' history is ? Traditions vary a little with the narrator ; so does 'history', and sometimes very much.

Let us take another case, of our own time. After the Moplah riots of only two decades ago, the Jagad-guru ('World-Teacher') Shankar-āchārya of the premier Matha (monastery) of Shringeri in the South, and the Madras Pandits, refused to 'purify' back into Hinduism, the many persons who had been *forcibly converted* to Islam. A *vyavasthā* (*responsa prudentum, dictum*, verdict, 'authoritative pronouncement on a question of religion') was, with difficulty, secured from a few

M. Gandhi says, in this article, that "there is unfortunately an unbridgable gulf between the Congress and the Muslim League". He said earlier, on another occasion, "The Muslim League blocks the way". It has been shown before, that the chief and the subordinate leaders of the Congress are to thank, for this state of affairs. The unbridgable gulf cannot be bridged by mere gaseous 'appeals for unity'; or by assertions (once made by M. Gandhi) that "the rights of minorities are a sacred trust", for the assurance of the Muslim League. The Muslim League can always say: 'We have had more than enough of these assurances by Government, and of this sacred-trust business, in the relations between white and colored peoples'. *What will bridge the gulf is a substantial Scheme of Swaraj which can be scrutinised.* The leaders of neither the Congress, nor the H.M. Sabha, nor the M. League, will talk *the* thing; but will talk endlessly *round* and round and *about* and about the thing. "Roundabout and roundabout and roundabout we go". None of them will put forward a Draft of a Constitution and say; 'Here is something concrete; point out the defects; and help with suggestions, to correct those defects; till we arrive at something which *does* satisfy all'. Instead, they all go on crying, in their varying words: 'Hindu rights must be safeguarded first', 'Muslim religion and culture must be first guaranteed', 'The M. League must first be recognised as sole represent-

Pandits of Benares, to the effect that such 'purification', and 're-conversion' back into their known castes, was not against the *Shāstras* ('sacred books'). Most of those Benares Pandits, who were regarded as the most learned, declined; because the more narrow-minded and bigoted a Pandit shows himself, the more 'ortho-dox' he is, and therefore the more highly honored by the masses! The old story of 'blind leaders of the blind', in all times and climes. The theologian-priest undergoes the same degeneration everywhere, in Hinduism, Christianity, Islam. 'Immunities', 'absolutions', 'pardons', from sins, can be 'purchased', in all religions, by adequate payment, in different ways, maybe. Hakim Ajmal Khan, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, and other Congress Muslims, learned in Islamic theology, helped the work of re-conversion of the Hindus, by courageously and honestly declaring the simple and just truth that *forcible* conversion to Islam was *not* conversion at all.

ative of Muslims', 'the Congress must first admit that it is a purely Hindu body', 'Independence must be given first', 'Constituent Assembly must be promised first', 'Power must be captured, first, Constituent Assembly will come after'—and so on and so forth.

The Vedanta-story of the six blind men touching different parts of an elephant, and insisting that the whole thing was only a thick column, or a vast drum, or a monstrous python, or a great stiff-bristled broom, or a very thick polished iron club; the Sufi-story of the four travellers from four lands, and speaking four languages, quarrelling, each in his own language, as to what food they should have; the Taoist story of the five senses of man, each insisting that *it* alone knew all there was to know; these are very apposite in this controversy. If only some person with eyes would guide the hands of each blind man over all the parts of the elephant; if only some fruit-vendor, who understood all the four languages, would produce a basketful of the grapes that all the four travellers were shouting for; if a wise 'mind' would tell all the five 'senses' that they all were nourished equally by the same 'stomach', and all subserved one 'mind-and-life'; if only some person would place before these wranglers, a concrete *Scheme of Swa-raj* which would, broadly speaking, satisfy the fundamental needs and cravings of all; then these quarrels would abate.¹ Who can be that person? The quarrellers have no confidence in each other, or even in themselves! Let them appoint a Committee, a Jury, of their Trusted, or least distrusted, Representatives; (in the case of the European nations, a Committee of their most Philanthropic Scientists). It will prepare the way for, and make very easy the work of, the future Constituent Assembly, (the Religio-Political League of Nations, in the other case). That seems the only way out. But they will not do even that.

¹These 'ifs' are *not* so difficult as M. Gandhi's. The late Deshbandhu C.R. Das and the present writer *did* sketch out one, in 1923, and put it before the Congress leaders and the Public; but they were all so busy 'fighting', that they had no time to think '*what for*' they were fighting; as, to-day, in Europe. The Scheme was shelved. The most difficult of all 'ifs' is—*If* the leaders had less egoism and more *common-sense*; the most *un-common* commodity, when persons are resolved on fighting and passions are surging.

Mr. Gandhi's reply to Mr. Amery.

M. Gandhi says in his press statement under reference: "Distress has been known to have softened people's hearts and made them mindful of facts: but Britain's distress has evidently left Mr. Amery cold and untouched." Diplomats' and politicians' hearts are not easily softened. Especially in the case of Britain has it been remarked, by shrewd observers, that her 'heart' is identical with her 'purse'. In cases of shipwreck, misers have been known to prefer to drown, clinging to their heavy bag of gold, rather than let it go, and swim, and be saved. We can only pray for Mr. Amery: 'Forgive him, O Lord!, for he knoweth no better.' It is the magic of the office-chair he occupies, which bewitches him, and makes him say and do what he is saying and doing. Whoever drinks of the cup of Circe, becomes transformed; unless fortified by 'the root *moly*', like Ulysses; i.e., with *comprehensive Principles*, firmly rooted in a *complete Philosophy of Life*. Other Secretaries of State for India, in the recent past, drawn from even the Labor party, have undergone a similar transfiguration. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald himself underwent "a change into something very strange", when he became Premier of Britain, in regard to India, and other matters. The Laborite colleagues of Mr. Churchill, today, in the Cabinet, have ceased to see eye to eye with the Labor M. P.'s not in office, in regard to India, and other matters.

**'Views may vary with View-point;
Principles should not.'**

That the view varies with the view-point, is natural and intelligible. The fact is amply recognised in ancient Indian thought; is even emphasised, as the prime means of reconciling various views¹. The same human being looks different, seen from the front, the back, the sides. That a person should dress in one way for riding, and in another way for sleeping quietly in bed, is common-sense. That the body and mind should be kept in health by appropriate work and avoidance of all excess, is an unvarying principle. If the *principles* change with change of position, then the person is *un-principled*: 'If I am weaker than you, then you have no right to bully me; but if I am stronger than you, then I have the right to bully you'.

¹Prasādhāna-bhēdād darśhāna-bhēdāh.; see p. 254, *supra*.

**Britain the 'Home of Liberty' for all ;
but not for the Indian.**

Britain has been the 'home of liberty' for many generations. Political refugees from other 'white' countries, have often found shelter with her. No Briton (so far as the present writer's very limited reading in history shows) has had to seek refuge in another country, because of political persecution, (though some have been hanged or shot for alleged treason), within the last two hundred years. But Britain's conduct towards India has been very different. Indians, fleeing from political persecution in British India, have had to seek refuge in countries other than Britain. For her failure to live up to her Principles, as the 'Home of Liberty', with respect to India, Britain has had to pay dearly in the past, and may have to pay still more grievously, in the future, if she does not realise and fulfil her clear duty to India, in time. All right-minded Indians, all sincere well-wishers of mankind, pray ardently that the British Government *may* realise and fulfil that duty without delay; and thereby convert India into a firm and faithful friend and powerful colleague for all time.

'See ourselves as others see us.'

'When will some god the giftie give them, to see themselves as others see them?' Unhappily, the gods do not readily give that great gift. Many sorrows, many great afflictions, in the long course of evolution; which *break* the hard selfish heart; which dissolve the whole lower nature; and re-form it, fashion it anew, 'into something rich and strange'; only such bring that precious, all-healing, all-reconciling, gift; to nations as well as individuals. To know all, to understand all, others as well as one-self, is to forgive all, to be-friend all, and is to pray for and receive forgiveness and friendship oneself.

In the meanwhile, "man, proud man, dressed in a little brief authority, most ignorant of what he's most assured, his glassy Essence", the One Self of All, in Whom all live and move and have their being, Who lives and moves and has His being in all, "plays such fantastic tricks before high Heaven, as make the angels weep", and Virtue cowers "tongue-tied by Authority."

Mr. Amery's Shifting Principles.

Jesus the Christ taught us, (and Mr. Amery calls himself Christian, does he not?): 'Do unto others as you would be done by'. Yet are we all doing unto others as we would *not*

be done by. Mrs. Annie Besant once asked the People of Britain, in public speech and writing: 'Would you like Germany to occupy Britain, as Britain is occupying India?'

Mr. Amery is causing the repression, in India, of the perfectly non-violent expression of conscientious objection, as if it were a violent rebellion against the Government; the same Mr. Amery, by broadcast speech, on 6.4.1941, encouraged the Yugo-Slav people in violent rebellion against their Government, which had signed a pact with Germany the previous day. To subtly *distinguish* between the two cases of Mr. Amery's conduct towards India, and his conduct towards Yugo-Slavia; to *justify* one and *condemn* the other; will require much juggling by a lawyer, or a diplomat, long-practised and accomplished in the art of splitting the hairs of words. So also, between Britain's most laudable endeavour to free Abyssinia from bondage to Italy, and restore Abyssinia's Emperor to her, (in the success of which endeavour, Indian troops have had the good fortune to play a prominent part), and Britain's clearly immoral keeping of India in bondage to herself. So also between Germany's pact with Yugo-Slavia, and England's treaty with Iraq; re passing or stationing of troops; bearing in mind that both Iraq and Yugo-Slavia were created by the treaty of Versailles, out of the ruins of the Turkish and the Austrian Empires.

For the protection of India from a lightning-rush of the Germans by land and air; for the saving of her utterly defenceless towns from the horrors of modern bombing from the air; their only defence being the fatalism with which they endure famines and epidemics of cholera, plague, small-pox; it is undoubtedly very desirable that as strong British forces should be thrown into Iraq as possible. But this still leaves the denouement to the 'chances' of war. And the movements of Japan and of Russia, calculable or unforeseeable, still remain unprovided for. Genuine co-operation and sincerely friendly *inter-dependence* between Britain and India, and consequent equitable and honorable Peace between Britain and Germany, and all the rest of the world, is far the better, indeed the best, the only permanent and real, solution of such problems.

Australia has been reported to be indignant because a small part of her force of a few thousands was sent to Greece, without consulting her; and the British Government has been offering explanations. The whole of India was flung into the war, neck and crop, without a thought of 'with your leave' or

'by your leave'. Even the Metropolitan of Calcutta, the highest official of the Ecclesiastical Department of the Government of India, has expressed disapproval of such action, (see p. 182, *supra*). Can Mr. Amery distinguish subtly between the two cases, except by saying that India is a 'Dependency,' and Australia is not?

In Britain, a Bill is reported to be on the legislative anvil, even while this hideous war is raging, to *grant compensation* to the citizens, for damage inflicted on them, *by the action of the enemy*; for which action, the British Government *may* plead that it is (at least directly) not responsible. In India, (e.g., in Benares and Cawnpore), the citizens have been, off and on, suffering serious losses, of life and of property, by the actions of criminal inciters, abettors, and active rioters; all of whom are subjects of the British Government; it is one main 'constituent function' and *duty* of the Government and its magistracy and police to keep such *veiled* as well as *visible* hooligans in check; the Government, the magistracy, the police, are paid heavy stipends for this purpose; and the Government have made provisions in the Criminal Procedure Code and given themselves all necessary powers; yet they fail to prevent these riots, and the consequent great loss of life and property to honest citizens. Now, all 'justice' equity, and good conscience' say that the Public Servants, who have failed in their duty of restraining criminals and protecting honest citizens, should be held responsible, should be called to account, and made to compensate the sufferers, out of their stipends; or, at the least, the compensation should be paid by the Government out of Public Funds;¹ and better arrange-

¹The Indian traditional law of the Hindus says:

Praṭi-āharṭum ashakyam syād dhanam chaura-hṛtam yadi,
 Taṭ swa-koshāṭ pra-ḍēyam syāt, ashaktēna-upa-jīvataḥ.
 (*Mbh.*, Shānti-parva, ch. 75).
 Stēnēshu-alabhya-mānēshu, rājā ḍalyāt svakāḍ grhāt.
 (*Nārada Smṛiti*).

(If the king cannot find their stolen goods
 And give them back unto the citizens,
 From his own treasury must he make good
 The loss of those who pay tax to maintain him).

The Iranian Muslim tradition is the same:

Cho dushman kharé rostāi barad,
 Malik bāj-o dah-yak che-rā mī khuraḍ? (Šā'pī)

ments made for the future, to prevent recurrence of such disturbances.

But what is done, instead?

Special Punitive Police are stationed in the town for a whole year. A very heavy Punitive Tax is imposed; to cover the cost of the punitive police, and compensation to sufferers from the riots. It is imposed on all citizens; excepting those with incomes below a given minimum, and some others. Mostly the innocent citizens are made to pay; mostly the rogues and criminals escape scot-free. When a scheme is put before the Government, on behalf of the citizens, for the creation of an effective, inexpensive, ever-ready Civic Guard, composed jointly of Hindus and Muslims, for the effectual prevention of such riots in future, as well as the satisfactory promotion of good understanding and good feeling between the two communities; the Government do not condescend to make a reply of any sort.

One is reminded of the Hindi proverb which says:

'The sinner sits in state upon the seat
Of judgment in this age of Kali-Discord,
And solemnly doth pass severe sentence
Upon the cowering victim of his sins.'¹

But even while saying this, the thought rushes in, that 'people get the sort of government they deserve'. Because 'cowering', because 'not self-respecting', because themselves seriously lacking in virtue, because not prepared to pay the price of liberty, therefore victimised. The Hindi proverb was framed by the Indian mass-mind in pre-British days, of Hindu and Muslim regime. Corresponding verses are to be found in Samskr̥t books two thousand years old, which

(If robbers steal the peasant's packs,
Why shall the king eat tithe and tax?)

¹Ulati chora koṭawālanhi dāndaī;
Thāngi karai chora kau nyāo;
Jabarā mārai, roye na dēwai;
Dekhau Kali-Juga kēr prabhāo.

Almost a literal translation would be,

(The thief doth pass sentence of punishment,
Upon the warder; the appeal is heard
By the receiver of the stolen goods;
The bully beats the child, and threatens him
With yet more beating if he vent a cry).

expressly say that, when-and where the rulers are bad, and the 'public servants' vicious and corrupt, then and there is the reign of King Kali, King 'Dis-cord,' of Sin, Falsehood, Hate, War; where the rulers and public servants are good, their reigns King 'Con-cord', Virtue, Truth, Love, Peace. In many of the 'advanced' and 'self-governing' countries of the west, the corruptness of the public services has been quite as bad as in India, it would seem; notoriously in the U.S.A., where secret societies like 'The Black Legion', 'The Silver Shirts', etc., supported by high and low officials, are said to have now taken the place of the Ku Klux Klan, and to be coercing and blackmailing at will, as Nazis are said to be.¹ Japan has some very powerful secret societies. So has China. In many Indian States to-day, 'Swa-rāj-īe' as they are, the government is far worse than in 'British' India; and the Hindi proverb holds almost literally true of them.

The Congress Ministry, and the Government.

The paragraph above, relating to Punitive Police and Tax, describes the actual experience of the present writer. A fuller account will not be amiss. In March, 1938, communal clashes occurred in Benares, on the occasion of the Spring festival known as Holi. The festival is a sort of Roman Catholic Carnival, a day of general merry-making. Originally, the day was dedicated to 'Chatur-shashti Dēvi', 'the Goddess of the four-and-sixty Arts', music, painting, sculpture, perfumery, delicious cookery, silk-and-velvet weaving, flower-gardening, games, sports, embroidery, etc.; in short, all that ministers to the refinement, enrichment, re-creation, of life. It was made the occasion for much artistic enjoyment, dance and song, exchange of perfumes, sprinklings with rose-water, peltings with flowers and fragrant powders. Muslims used to join with Hindus in such elegant and friendly convivialities. Latterly, with the growing poverty of the land, and great changes in all the conditions of living, especially in the nature of Education, Life has become greyer, more strenuous, more care-laden, for Hindus and Muslims alike. Population has gone on increasing, by leaps and bounds, in thriftless, pauperised, uninstructed India, quite as much as in other much richer, much better instructed, western countries. Struggle for existence, jealousies, rivalries, have worsened. Unemployment stalks the land. The whole moral atmosphere has

¹See, f. i., Upton Sinclair's books, among others.

become vitiated; nerves are bare, always on edge; tempers short, irritable; men more ready to mix in a squalid scrimmage, than in tasteful merry-making. The refinements of art also have degenerated into coarse jokes, obscene songs, vulgar horse-play—somewhat like the ‘Maffekings’ and ‘Christmas revellings’ of the uncultured sections and slum-populations of Britain. Thus it has come to pass that, like ‘Music before Mosque’ every day, Holi has become an occasion for fighting every year. The fanatics of neither party can bear to see members of the other party at all happy.

In the minor riots of March, 1938, in Benares, about a dozen Hindus and Muslims were killed, and about two score injured. The present writer was at New Delhi at that time, attending a session of the Central Legislative Assembly. After the riots, a public meeting was held in the Town Hall, and a small Peace Committee or Unity Board was formed, to which Hindus and Muslims were elected in equal numbers. On his return to Benares, from Delhi, the writer received a letter, signed by all the members of the Unity Board, and also by the District Magistrate and the District Superintendent of Police, desiring him to take up the work of Chairman of the Board. He could not refuse. The Committee worked for some months, trying to settle disputes as they arose, from time to time, and place to place, in the town.

Tension began to grow, however, in February, 1939, over various points, which were settled with difficulty. But, because of what the Benares public holds to be culpable remissness on the part of certain police-officials, despite previous intimations and warnings; and their failure to take action to get the known or strongly suspected mischief-makers bound down by bonds and sureties to keep the peace; and despite all the efforts of the Unity Board, which had no executive powers at all, of any sort, and could only exhort and remonstrate with the public, by holding public meetings and issuing printed leaflets, on the one hand, and making suggestions to the local magistracy and police on the other; riots broke out again, at Holi-time, early in March, 1939. They were much more violent and long-continued than those of 1938. Resulting casualties and damage have been mentioned before, (p. 229, *supra*).

The Unity Board, thereupon, sent up the Scheme spoken of above, to the Government. It had been unanimously agreed upon by all the members of the Board, Hindu and

Muslim alike. It was to this effect: Those who could be actually convicted of the crimes committed in the course of the riots, should be made to pay compensation to the injured individuals or families; for the permanent safe-guarding of the town, a Civic Guard, of about 1000 men and 100 minor officers, like sergeants, should be created; it should consist of able-bodied Hindu and Muslim citizens of the town, 'selected' or 'elected' by the citizens, in the proportion of the two communities in the population of the town, and possessed of certain minimum educational qualifications; the men and officers, being semi-honorary, and on duty for only part-time every day, (though available for whole-time duty in emergency), should be given only a small allowance, (about 100 rupees per man per year on the average), besides a simple uniform; the expenses should be met by the Municipality, by doubling the house-tax, (about $1\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs of rupees, from about 40000 houses); the surplus should be spent on compensating sufferers; the Guards should patrol the town, in small squads, made up jointly of Hindus and Muslims; being drawn from the citizens, they would have ample opportunities, during such patrol-work, of cultivating intimacy among themselves, and promoting friendly relations between the homes they visited, and would, all the time, feel a keen personal interest in maintaining peace in the town.

The Congress Ministry was in power, at the time the Scheme was sent up to the U. P. Government. The most regrettable feature of the whole affair is that *such* a Ministry ignored the Scheme. It failed to see that the Scheme would have excellently initiated the teaching of that *Self-defence*, of which Mahatma Gandhi has now realised and expressed the need; and, at the same time, would have taken a long step in ensuring the active practical *co-operation* of Hindus and Muslims—without which the country is perishing—in one of the most fundamental functions of Swa-raj or Self-government, for the promotion of general welfare. Instead of approving and sanctioning the Scheme, with such improvements as might have occurred to it, the Ministry allowed itself to be guided by the usual bureaucratic spirit and routine of the Secretariat; blindly imposed the imported, stiff, unsympathetic, irritating, Punitive Police for a year; and inflicted the utterly unjust Punitive Tax, which added further injury to the injury already suffered by the town.

The tax was assessed by a special office-staff. The

assessment totalled about six lakhs of rupees ; about half a lakh for the expense on the assessing staff ; about three lakhs for that on the extra Police, about 300 in number, (about 1000 rupees per man per year on the average) ; and about two and a half lakhs for compensation.

If the Scheme of the Unity Board had been accepted, and the house-tax been doubled automatically ; all the disproportionately heavy expense on the new temporary assessing staff would have been saved ; the invidiousness and malpractices of the new assessment would have been avoided ; the inordinate, infructuous, sterile outlay upon the Police would have been saved ; the very important civic duty of self-defence would have been brought home, literally, to every citizen ; a long-lost feeling of confidence, in themselves and their neighbours, would have been found anew by all householders ; and, with a 'home-made' Civic Guard, the citizens would have had the great satisfaction of supporting, to however small an extent, 'their own young men'.

More : With the chances, in the present condition of feelings brought about between the two communities, of riots breaking out anywhen and anywhere ; such Punitive Police can never act as a 'preventive' ; not even as a 'cure'. It is like locking the stable after the horse has been stolen. When the temptations to intemperance and dissipation are not removed, are even fostered, the mere fact that the person has had to drink a bottle of nauseating medicine in the past, does not act even as a 'deterrent'. Yet more : We all know that, for whatever reasons, of extensively ramified machinations and engineering or of spontaneity, these riots occur in many places, at once, like epidemics. To how many such places can a Government rush special police-forces ; in how many, impose punitive police ? A system of Civic Guards, on the other hand, could be made country-wide, with the glad co-operation of the people, to their lasting benefit every way, promotive of mental, moral, physical health, preventive of ills.

The Congress Ministry failed to see all these plain things. The cause was this : The Congress Ministries took up office entirely *unprepared*. Shri C. Rajagopalachari, (who had been Premier in Madras), confessed, in an article in *The Hindustan Times*, early in 1940, (the note of the date has unfortunately been lost), that the Congress went into office *without any preparation* for the work it had to do. But whose fault was it that they could not and did not

make such preparation? They had been crying and struggling for 'Swa-raj' since 1920, in the new ways prescribed by M. Gandhi. Why could they not think out beforehand what they would do when at least a piece, if not the whole, of 'Swa-raj' was put before them, and was *accepted* and *taken up* by them? They had seventeen whole years to do the thinking, from 1920 to 1937. They had the riots going on all around them, all that time. They knew, (if they did not, then they were very unfit indeed for their work), that to prevent them would be almost their first and most important task. They failed miserably to perform that task. Their Generalissimo, M. Gandhi, himself not a member of the Congress since 1934, yet supreme guide of it, was unable to give them any useful guidance in this matter. When riots came, he kept riding his Pegasus in the uppermost regions of the stratosphere. He wrote, in his weekly, to the effect that a Congress Ministry, worth its name and its salt, should be able to do entirely without police and without military, in the checking of these riots; and that Congressmen should fling themselves between opposing armies of rioters, and allow themselves to be cut to pieces by both. The obedient generals and soldiers of the Generalissimo quietly ignored the reproofs and the admonitions. Later on, in June-July, 1940, Shri Rajagopalachari, till then regarded as the second heart of M. Gandhi, had to tell the latter, in round terms, to the effect that he was an 'unpractical idealist', and the 'realities' of office were different from the 'idealities' of those not in office. Yet Shri Rajagopalachari had been a similar 'unpractical idealist' up to the moment he became Premier of Madras; and he was much beyond middle age, and much experienced in public life, then. To the layman, the plain man-in-the-street, it seems that both these great leaders of the people have been very greatly at fault—in *not thinking out beforehand*, carefully, what the 'definition' of Swa-raj, its substantial practical content, its methods and 'policies', its 'war-and-peace-aims', its specific solutions of specific problems, economic, religious, educational, political, cultural, social, etc., should be. They and their colleagues and subordinates, all, had been comfortably delegating all that troublesome brain-racking work to the *future* Constituent Assembly. But yet they allow a bit of Swaraj to fall plump into their hands, without the Constituent Assembly having even met and cleared the way and made the driving easy for them! They should have insisted on holding their

'C. A. first, before taking up office! Some of us have been crying, ever since 1920, to the Public and the Public's leaders, the Generalissimo and the generals, the High Command and the Low Command of the Congress, the Muslim Leaguers and the Hindu Sabha-ites, to clear up their own minds and the minds of their followings, on these all-important, vitally essential, points, first and foremost. But it has all been crying in the wilderness.

Our Generalissimo, with all his indubitable spiritual fervour, has been no wiser, in these very 'practical' matters, than the Warriors of the West, who are shouting for Victory for the sake of Victory. It goes very much against the grain to have to say anything at all harsh, of a person whom one reveres for his high spiritual quality; but circumstances sometimes compel plain-speaking. Mahatma Gandhi's opinions vacillate greatly from time to time, in respect of 'practical' 'administrative' matters. Though he reproved the Congress Ministers of the U. P. and other provinces for using police and military, and even approving of police opening fire on unruly crowds, in dealing with riots and strikes; yet, some years ago, he clearly wrote in his weekly, that a Swaraj Government would have to maintain a minimum amount of military and police, for internal peace and order. More or less similar is the case with his views as to violence and non-violence; as to passive resistance and active self-defence; as to pure Khadi and Swadeshi mill products; as to the subtleties of Satyagraha, when and what form of it is right and when and what form of it is wrong. So subtle are his casuistical arguments, so difficult to understand, that even his nearest and closest intimates do not understand them, and do not act according to them. He himself has said that he alone knows the mysteries of the Science and Art of Satyagraha. As a patent fact, after the election of Shri Subhas Chandra Bose for the Presidentship of the Tripuri Congress, in 1939, Mahatma Gandhi said that that election, against his (M. Gandhi's) nominee, was his (M. Gandhi's) 'personal defeat,' and he 'advised' all those who felt 'uncomfortable' within the Congress, to resign from it. *Not one* of his most devoted followers resigned. At Wardha (21. 6. 1940) and Poona (28. 7. 1940), the Wkg. and A.I.C. Committees parted company from him formally, over the issue of 'Non-Violence as the only possible *policy* in India's struggle for freedom' *vs.* 'N.-V.' as unconditional religious *principle*, even

for a free India's national defence'. But neither could get on without the other. So they joined again, at Bombay, (A.I.C.C., 15. 9. 1940) on the *tacit* understanding, (whatever the carefully worded and guarded 'diplomatic' *verbal* professions might be), that Non-Violence is the *best and only possible policy*, in the circumstances ; something which is in accord with commonsense, as well as reason, philosophy, science.

Why all these oscillations and vacillations ? *Because* heads are not clear, and hearts not sincere, as to the nature of the Social Structure, (economic, educational, political, religious, etc.), needed to secure *equitable* general welfare for all human beings ; in India, any more than in the rest of Asia, in Europe, in America, in Africa. The least un-clear, the least in-sincere, in this vital matter, is 'Bolshevism', by the accounts of British writers themselves¹ ; but very far from satisfactory, and vitiated by serious psychological errors ; and it is being steadily corrupted, further, it seems, by increasing nationalist militarism ; partly growing from within, out of psychological defects ; partly forced from without, by the militarist activities of neighbours. The next in order is Nazism ; it has certain fairly defined *Peace Aims*, (as distinguished from its War-aim, which is destruction of British Imperialism²), as to the Social Structure needed ; but it is seriously vitiated, and made very dangerous for neighbours, by its blaring and overbearing Germanism, its ruthless nationalist and imperialist militarism³ ; but it also can plead, in partial extenuation, like Russia, that the attitudes and activities of other Powers have forced it. Then comes Fascism whose war-aims and peace-aims alike are blatantly militarist and ruthlessly nationalist and capitalist imperialism. But the British Government has deliberately

¹ For instance, G.B. Shaw, C.E.M. Joad, L. Fischer, H.G. Wells, etc.

² See E.O. Lorimer, *What Hitler Wants*, chs. v and vi.

³ *Ibid*, ch. vii. The later chapters of the book describe the doings of Nazis to Jews and to Germans of other parties, their concentration-camps, and their views regarding other than Germanic races. They read like the doings of Roman Catholics and Protestants to each other, in the days of Mary and Elizabeth, in Britain ; of the Inquisition generally, in other countries ; of 'secret societies' in many countries ; and like the ways of 'white' races towards 'blacks' and slaves.

and stubbornly declined all declaration of *Peace-aims*; while, as to War-aim, it has, all along, reiterated this to be Victory and the destruction of Hitlerism. The 'war-aim' of the Congress is the undefined word 'Swaraj'; its 'peace-aim', i.e., the *meaning* of the word Swaraj, is to be put into the word by the future Constituent Assembly! If that C.A. is to decide what are to be the *meaning*, nature, policies, of Swaraj, *why* not have let it also decide whether India wants the word 'Swa-raj' or not? Why should the Congress leaders and the Congress take it upon themselves to decide that the country wants 'Swaraj'? With reference to the subtly elusive unfixability of M. Gandhi, Shri Jamnadas Mehta has recorded this: "He has given seven mutually destructive definitions of Swaraj; and when I pointed this out at the Karachi Congress in 1931, he threatened to increase the number to twenty."¹ The threat might have been a joke, as it was presumably meant to be. But there are some matters which cannot be disposed of by jokes. Seven conflicting definitions have produced sevenfold evils. M. Gandhi may well spare himself the trouble of producing thirteen more. All his intense patriotism, philanthropy, ascetic mortifications of the flesh, tireless and incessant labors for the uplift of India, have gone astray, have worse than failed, have *acerbated* and made more pervasive the spirit of *separatism* and *conflict* in *all* aspects of Indian life—because of this, his one great failure to put a definite Scheme of Swaraj, as a clear uniting Objective, before the People; in *all* aspects, not only as between Hindus and Muslims; because he has failed to teach the people that 'Swa', in 'Swa-raj', does not mean the *lower* self of Egoism, but the *higher* Self of Altruism. The result of the failure has been that every interest, every section, group, caste, sect, even every family, every individual, thinks that Swa-raj means '*my rāj*'; whence all-pervasive clash and conflict.

¹ Foreword by Jamnadas M. Mehta, (Barrister, ex-Finance Minister, Bombay), to *Gandhi-Muslim Conspiracy*, by a Hindu Nationalist, (pub. 1941). Shri J.M. Mehta was a zealous Congressman, and braved jail; but became disillusioned. He has recently been elected to the Central Legislative Assembly, in a bye-election, in which he defeated a Congress candidate. The book, for which he has written the Foreword, might have been more useful if it had been more mindful of the grievous sins of the Hindus, and recognised that the Muslims, with all their indubitable faults, were by no means wholly to blame.

Because of such temporising, haphazard, definitions which are non-definitions, which simply 'put off' the people, just as the promises of the British Government have been doing; the Congress Ministries went into office entirely *un-prepared* for anything else than temporising, haphazard, patchwork bungling; so far as the initiation of new legislative and administrative measures for the *general welfare*, of the People as a whole, was concerned. They had *not thought out* any Systematic Plan for ameliorating the National Life, by appropriate measures; measures, which would not cause sudden, violent, and extensive upsets, but would help on steady and even progress, with equitable protection and promotion of all just interests. Therefore, in the presence of emergencies, they had to fall helplessly into the hands and the ways of the permanent bureaucracy.

That bureaucracy has a very strong *esprit de corps*, and its set and pet words and notions, 'practicality', 'realities', 'hard facts', 'efficiency', 'responsibility', 'man on the spot', 'trust us', 'wait and see', 'due course'; and its long-practised ways of red tape, leisurely procedure, and lordly feeling and manner of 'public-master' instead of 'public-servant' or even 'public-friend'. It often says with pompous solemnity, 'the man on the spot, a responsible officer of this Government, has carefully investigated the matter and has reported so-and-so; or has recommended thus-and-thus; or could not possibly have committed such a mistake, or acted otherwise, or done such an act'; and so on. But the public knows well what it all means. A 'responsible' officer means one who is an adept at *shifting* responsibility from his own shoulders to those of some one else, preferably some citizen. Every law is, in reality, made by the Executive, the Official, the Public Servant, by direct initiation of legislation, or consent at the end. The Legislature is very largely a mere show-piece. And every law adds to the responsibilities and burdens of the Public, and to the powers, privileges, opportunities, conveniences, of the Public Servant. Every day, the Public wanes, and the Public Servant waxes, and becomes Public Master, more and more.

The Congress Ministers fell under the glamour of the 'chair of office'; as Mr. Amery and the Labor Ministers have done. They imposed the Punitive Police and Tax on Benares, in accordance with the law, made long ago by the Executive

Government;¹ a law which makes the *citizens* 'responsible,' for the consequences of the failure in their duty of the 'responsible' *magistracy and police*. Shortly after, they resigned office at M. Gandhi's call to Satyagraha. The Benares Unity Board sent a reminder of their Civic Guard Scheme and a request for the cancellation of the orders re police and tax, to the bureaucratic Government which had taken up all power again. The reminder and request were ignored completely. For reasons, see pp. 165, 249-250, *supra*.

Finally, it should be mentioned that as these pages are going through the press, the local daily reports that, since the collection of the punitive tax began, so many as *twelve thousand* of the assesses have become *untraceable*—after some fifty thousand rupees, and almost a whole year, had been spent on preparing the assessment lists with all needed details¹; that the executive proposed to make up the deficit by increasing, by 50 p. c., the amount leviable (and realised) from the remaining traceable and traced and well-to-do assesses; and that, in consequence of a great outcry against this outrageously iniquitous proposal, the U. P. Government is reconsidering the matter, and the local executive is staying its hand in the meanwhile.

Mr. Amery and India.

In the preceding section, we have tried to illustrate, by the manner in which a Congress Ministry dealt with the Benares Riots, the baneful consequences of the lack of a carefully thought out comprehensive Plan of Administrative and Legislative Measures, promotive of, the General Welfare of all sections of the public, in the setting of a Social Structure, based on fixed Principles of Psycho-physiology and Spiritual, Material Outlook on and Philosophy of Life. We may now turn again to Mr. Amery's lack of any such fixed principles.

¹It is worth noting that one of these U.P. Ministers, when a member of the Central Legislative Assembly, some three years earlier, said in a speech there, that it was within his personal first-hand knowledge, that a Commissioner of a Division, having reason to suspect that a riot was brewing, and that one of his subordinates was concocting the brew, threatened that subordinate with condign punishment, if any riot occurred; with the result that none occurred. It is well-known that crimes bring rich harvest to the corrupt in the police. Blackmailing of many guiltless persons is easy after riots.

In the House of Commons, on 27. 2. 1933, in a debate on Japan's invasion of Manchuria, Mr. Amery said: "Japan has got a very powerful case, based upon fundamental *realities*. She was quite *right* in acting with the object of creating *peace* and *order* in Manchuria, and defending herself against the continual *aggression* of Chinese nationalism. Our whole policy in India, our whole policy in Egypt, stands condemned, if we 'condemn Japan'¹." The last sentence would have the merit of being an honest confession, if Mr. Amery spoke it in the spirit of confession. Instead, he spoke it in the spirit of aggressive justification of unjustifiable aggression. He added insult to injury. Because British politicians say such things, therefore German politicians say similar things, substituting the words 'Germany' for 'Japan'; 'Europe including Britain' for 'Manchuria, India, Egypt'; 'British imperialist nationalism' for 'Chinese nationalism'. For Mr. Amery to characterise Chinese *defensive* nationalism as 'aggressive', is for the pot to call (not the kettle but) the white tea-cup black. We have seen before, in discussing the views of Prof. Cramb and Prof. Treitschke, that there is little difference between the imperialisms of Britain and Germany.

Each belligerent says and does the same things.

When will the belligerents do some serious introspection, and become really aware and fully conscious of the fact that *each* is *doing* unto the other what he would *not be done* unto by that other!

Each belligerent reviles the other in the same words; imputes the same base, wicked, malignant motives to the other; charges the other with double-dealing, treachery, black-mail, bluff; ascribes the same high, noble, benignant and beneficent motives to himself; maintains elaborate systems of espionage; employs the same strategies and stratagems against the other; endeavours to overpass the other in the invention and use of more and more destructive weapons. The gunners, bombers, torpedoers, of each, take the same gloating 'sportsmanlike' joy in 'scoring hits', and destroying the ships, planes, tanks, towns, combatants and non-combatants of the other. Each proclaims over and over again that he is growing stronger every week, and can carry on the war

¹Compare quotation from Mr. William Hard's article, p. 245, *supra*.

for any number of years; declares recurrently that his own victory is sure in the end; that the other is beoming economically exhausted, is weakening for want of food, has been reduced to dog's-flesh or potatoes, is being rationed more and more severely. Britain says she cannot allow food to be sent, by U.S.A. or neutral countries, to enemy-occupied starving countries, because it is taken by Germany for its own civil and military uses, 'is even transformed into' war-munitions; Germany says, no laws of war require a victor to feed occupied countries; and the unhappy 'occupied' countries suffer from both sides, now; from devitalising drain by Germany, and from bombing by Britain; even those countries which have sacrificed themselves to help Britain. Each belligerent charges the other with creating and maintaining 'Quislings', dummies, puppets. Each treats the friendliest advice, if at all dissentient, as treason; uses 'honeyed words' for coaxing neutrals to its side; sneers scornfully at the other for doing the same thing.

If there is any difference between the cases of the two, it is that Britain openly and frankly admits that she is dependent upon the U.S.A. for the war, that her ability to keep it up depends upon the U.S.A.'s willingness and ability to give her an unceasing and adequate supply of aircraft, munitions, raw materials, food goods; while Hitler has not made any similar admission, because his armies live on the occupied countries. He has offered peace terms from time to time, which have been treated with contempt by the British Government; naturally; because one of the terms has been the replacement, of Mr. Churchill and several other Ministers, by persons more agreeable to Hitler, and because "Germany's demand for the return of her colonies is irrevocable." The British Government's condition of peace is the destruction of Hitlerism, i.e., abolition of Hitler; which is, equally naturally, unacceptable to Hitler. Mr. Churchill calls Herr Hitler "the supreme miscreant"; Herr Hitler calls Mr. Churchill "the diabolical fanatic." British politicians say that Hitler is the sole cause of the war; German politicians, that Churchill is the sole cause. So the horrible war proceeds, unending.

The squalid Indian aping of the mighty world-devastating war of leviathans is, that the Muslim League says that the Hindus are solely to blame; and the Hindu Sabha says that the Muslims are wholly in the wrong; each indulges in vituperation and challenges against the other; and misguided, misled, demoralised, propaganda-maddened, befooled and

In the House of Commons, on 27. 2. 1933, in a debate on Japan's invasion of Manchuria, Mr. Amery said: "Japan has got a very powerful case, based upon fundamental *realities*. She was quite *right* in acting with the object of creating *peace* and *order* in Manchuria, and defending herself against the continual *aggression* of Chinese nationalism. Our whole policy in India, our whole policy in Egypt, stands condemned, if we condemn Japan"¹. The last sentence would have the merit of being an honest confession, if Mr. Amery spoke it in the spirit of confession. Instead, he spoke it in the spirit of aggressive justification of unjustifiable aggression. He added insult to injury. Because British politicians say such things, therefore German politicians say similar things, substituting the words 'Germany' for 'Japan'; 'Europe including Britain' for 'Manchuria, India, Egypt'; 'British imperialist nationalism' for 'Chinese nationalism'. For Mr. Amery to characterise Chinese *defensive* nationalism as 'aggressive', is for the pot to call (not the kettle but) the white tea-cup black. We have seen before, in discussing the views of Prof. Cramb and Prof. Treitschke, that there is little difference between the imperialisms of Britain and Germany.

Each belligerent says and does the same things.

When will the belligerents do some serious introspection, and become really aware and fully conscious of the fact that *each* is *doing* unto the other what he would *not be done* unto by that other!

Each belligerent reviles the other in the same words; imputes the same base, wicked, malignant motives to the other; charges the other with double-dealing, treachery, black-mail, bluff; ascribes the same high, noble, benignant and beneficent motives to himself; maintains elaborate systems of espionage; employs the same strategies and stratagems against the other; endeavours to overpass the other in the invention and use of more and more destructive weapons. The gunners, bombers, torpedoers, of each, take the same gloating 'sportsmanlike' joy in 'scoring hits', and destroying the ships, planes, tanks, towns, combatants and non-combatants of the other. Each proclaims over and over again that he is growing stronger every week, and can carry on the war

¹Compare quotation from Mr. William Hard's article, p. 245, *supra*.

for any number of years; declares recurrently that his own victory is sure in the end; that the other is beoming economically exhausted, is weakening for want of food, has been reduced to dog's-flesh or potatoes, is being rationed more and more severely. Britain says she cannot allow food to be sent, by U.S.A. or neutral countries, to enemy-occupied starving countries, because it is taken by Germany for its own civil and military uses, 'is' even transformed into war-munitions; Germany says, no laws of war require a victor to feed occupied countries; and the unhappy 'occupied' countries suffer from both sides, now; from devitalising drain by Germany, and from bombing by Britain; even those countries which have sacrificed themselves to help Britain. Each belligerent charges the other with creating and maintaining 'Quislings', dummies, puppets. Each treats the friendliest advice, if at all dissentient, as treason; uses 'honeyed words' for coaxing neutrals to its side; sneers scornfully at the other for doing the same thing.

If there is any difference between the cases of the two, it is that Britain openly and frankly admits that she is dependent upon the U.S.A. for the war, that her ability to keep it up depends upon the U.S.A.'s willingness and ability to give her an unceasing and adequate supply of aircraft, munitions, raw materials, food goods; while Hitler has not made any similar admission, because his armies live on the occupied countries. He has offered peace terms from time to time, which have been treated with contempt by the British Government; naturally; because one of the terms has been the replacement, of Mr. Churchill and several other Ministers, by persons more agreeable to Hitler, and because "Germany's demand for the return of her colonies is irrevocable." The British Government's condition of peace is the destruction of Hitlerism, i.e., abolition of Hitler; which is, equally naturally, unacceptable to Hitler. Mr. Churchill calls Herr Hitler "the supreme miscreant"; Herr Hitler calls Mr. Churchill "the diabolical fanatic." British politicians say that Hitler is the sole cause of the war; German politicians, that Churchill is the sole cause. So the horrible war proceeds, unending.

The squalid Indian aping of the mighty world-devastating war of leviathans is, that the Muslim League says that the Hindus are solely to blame; and the Hindu Sabha says that the Muslims are wholly in the wrong; each indulges in vituperation and challenges against the other; and misguided, misled, demoralised, propaganda-maddened, befooled and

criminalised. Hindus and Muslims attack and destroy each others' lives and goods in riots ; after which, the police, the magistracy, the Government, come in to impose further burdens upon the victims.

While these Titans of Europe are locked in a deadly grapple of 'catch-as-catch-can', and the Indian pygmies are trying to copy their bombs, shells, and torpedoes, with cudgels, knives, and fire-rags ; while Britain is determined to retain, at whatever cost to herself and the rest of the world, the fourth of the earth's surface which she has 'inherited', not by 'meekness', but by aggressive enterprise, fighting valour, scientific weapons, organising skill, and national solidarity ; while Germany is equally resolved to wrench back from Britain, with the same recklessness of cost, the colonies wrested away from her by Britain, after the previous World-War, and, thereafter, to reduce the whole of the rest of the world to subservience, or even servitude, to herself ; while this stupendous struggle is going on, we Indians, at least such of us as sincerely, fervently, wish and pray for the welfare of all Mankind, can only bow our heads and hearts to the Mystery, and beg, with the whole strength of our souls, that the hearts of Britain's rulers may be granted grace ; may be softened ; may turn to thoughts of Peace ; may begin with Justice and Charity at home ; may establish a British-Indian Commonwealth ; and may, thereby, *compel* Germany's rulers, by *moral* force, to bow to Britain, to acknowledge Britain's supreme sacrifice of all selfishness, her perfect moral regeneration, and *impel* them from within their own hearts, to join gladly in ushering in the Millennium of the longed-for World Federation, Peace on all the Earth, and Good Will among all Human Beings ; or, if they should still remain perversely obdurate, then *compel* them to submit, by the *physical* force, of 80 million Britons and Colonials, 130 million U.S. Americans, 400 million Indians, and indeed all the rest of the human world.

British-Indian Commonwealth ;

Consensus there-anent.

It has been said before, over and over again, that the establishment of a genuine British-Indian Commonwealth (—*not* severance of connection between the two countries and peoples—), is the innermost 'heart's desire' of *all* the political and communal parties of India. But the Commonwealth must be genuinely such ; without any legal quibblings and

pettifoggings, diplomatic loopholes and chicane, word-catching and hair-splitting hypocrisies and prevarications. It must be a Federation of sincerely co-operating, mutually loyal, mutually respecting, thoroughly friendly, *inter-dependent* States ; bound together by solemn oaths and ceremonies, through representatives, for the Prevention of Harm to any, and the Promotion of the General Welfare of all, on lines of Equity, Justice, Good Conscience, and, even more, of good Rational Scientific *Planning* ; lines broadly but clearly marked out, for all the World to see, and to copy, as eminently reasonable and excellent example.

British-Indian Commonwealth—Surest Nucleus of World-Commonwealth.

Such a British-Indian Commonwealth, such a Federation, representing the Union of East and West, would be the finest and surest Nucleus of that World Federation, that Universal Brotherhood, which has been yearned for and pined for by all true Lovers of Mankind, true Servants of the God in all, and true resisters of the Satan in all, who also, unfortunately, hides in all ; hides, and rushes out, from time to time, overpoweringly, in obedience to the Law of Dual Polarity which pervades all Nature, by the command of the God, the Universal Self, *whose* Nature she is ; for, without such Duality, the World-Process were impossible.

Creed and Demand of Congress.

From 1908 to 1919, the Creed and Demand of the Congress was 'Self-Government on Colonial lines', i.e., Dominion Status. The Liberal-Moderate Party held the Congress, more or less, till 1918. Its demand has continued the same, all along. After the Amritsar Massacre of 1919, the spirit, the manner, the methods, of the political struggle changed. Mahatma Gandhi and his colleagues came into power in the Congress. The Creed was changed to 'Swaraj', at the Nagpur Session, in 1920. Swa-raj and Self-government are literal equivalents. The specifying words, 'on Colonial lines', were omitted. But no other words were put in. It clearly remained possible to replace them, positively, or in interpretation. At the Ahmedabad Congress of 1921, when some speakers talked of 'complete independence', M. Gandhi said plainly that, if his leadership was acceptable to the Congress, he could lead the country to only Dominion Status.

Thus, the Objective remained substantially the same as before, till the Calcutta Congress of 1928. At that session, a

Constitution for India, drafted by the (Pt. Motilal) Nehru Committee, and approved by an All-Parties Convention, was adopted by the Congress. The Constitution was, more or less, along 'Colonial lines', and made no provision for a systematic Economic Structure, i.e., Reconstruction of (Indian) Society.

The Nehru Cttee. Scheme of Swaraj.

The Introduction, by the Committee, to the Scheme, says that the proposal of any such Economic Structure, vitally important, indeed essential, though it was, had been deliberately omitted, because it was not included in their 'terms of reference'. The reason might have been appropriate in a report by a legalist, hair-splitting, responsibility-shirking, work-prolonging, time-wasting, red-tapist, 'bureaucratic' Committee. It was scarcely appropriate, in a People's Committee. But the People's Committee was largely composed of lawyers, presided over by a very eminent one.

Lifelong habits of mind are not easily changed. Many of the best, most self-sacrificing, most patriotic leaders of the Congress have been lawyers. Lokamanya B.G. Tilak was. Lala Lajpat Rai was. Pt. Motilal Nehru was. Swami Shradhānand also was, when he was named Lala Munshi Ram, before he became a *sannyāsi*. Deshbandhu C. R. Das and Vitthalbhai Patel were. Mahatma Gandhi is. Pt. Jawaharlal is. Shri Rājagopālāchārī is. And many other prominent leaders; as in Britain. Legal training is very useful for such work as that of a 'non-violent' Congress, to guide the people's progress consonantly with 'law and order', 'in lawful and orderly ways'; by "all peaceful and legitimate means", as the Nagpur Congress of 1920 laid down, when changing (the wording of) the Creed. But, every virtue has its vice. Legal training creates certain mental defects also; tendency to hair-splitting, dilatoriness, argumentativeness, excessive technicality, losing the end in the means.

The Nehru Committee's Scheme of Swaraj was thus, as a Hindi proverb says, 'a marriage-procession without the bridegroom'; or as might be said in medical terms, 'a malaria reeipe with the quinine left out.' The present writer endeavoured to draw attention to the lack, at the A. P. Convention; without success. The Scheme was adopted by the Calcutta Congress. Shri Subhas Chandra Bose's party wanted that it should be sent to the British Government, with an ultimatum: 'Agree at once or we declare for Complete Independence and start Satyagraha'. Mahatma Gandhi proposed: 'Within two

years', instead of 'at once'. To avoid a split, a compromise was arrived at: 'Within *one year*'. At the succeeding Congress session at Lahore, in Dec. 1929, the British Government having given no sign of agreement, the Creed was changed to 'Complete Independence', after midnight between 31-12-1929 and 1-1-1930. The Salt Satyagraha began in 1930.

M. Gandhi wants only the 'Substance of Independence'.

Mahatma Gandhi continued to explain to the public, from time to time, that 'Independence' meant, to him, only 'the Substance of Independence'. Down to 1937, he was expressly of that opinion. In that year, in a published letter, he openly wrote to that same effect, in reply to an enquiry by Mr. H. L. S. Polak (an old colleague of his, in South Africa, some forty years ago, when he was carrying on Satyagraha there, in defence of Indians' human rights). He has used the words 'the Substance of Independence' repeatedly; and genuine Dominion Status, in an Indo-British Commonwealth, embodies that 'substance' all right enough.

It was only the British Government's obdurate intransigence that drove M. Gandhi to change 'Swaraj' for 'Purna Swaraj' or 'Complete Independence'. It was only a formal change. It was probably also due, partly, to the wish to keep in close touch with, and a restraining hand upon, some colleagues who were less able to check their ever-mounting indignation against the ways of the British Government. He felt, perhaps, that they might break away, and then possibly go astray, and lead themselves and the country into harm; if he did not preserve at least a *verbal* agreement with them; if he emphasised his difference from them too strongly, by insisting on his own words. His recent break from, and re-union with, the Working Committee and A.I.C.C., in June-September, 1940, may be said to illustrate the same wish, at bottom; the difference being only theoretical, verbal, not substantial.

Various Statements and Resolutions, of the W. and A.I.C. Cttees. of the Congress.

The A.I.C.C.'s Bombay resln. of 15-9-1940 approves of and endorses the Poona resln. of 27-7-1940, (*not* that of 28-7-1940), and the subsequent W. Cttee.'s Wardha resln. of August; says that the proposal which was made, in the resln.,¹ "even

¹The Poona A.I.C.C. resln. (28-7-1940) which M. Gandhi condemned, was very brief: "This meeting of the A.I.C.C. confirms the W. Cttee.'s Delhi resln. of July 7, 1940."

at the sacrifice of M. Gandhi's co-operation, in order to end the deadlock in India, and to promote the national cause, *in co-operation with the British People*,...was rejected by the British Govt. in a manner which left no doubt that they... would, if they could, continue to hold this country indefinitely in bondage for British exploitation..."; and that thereby, the British Govt. imposes "upon the Congress a struggle for the preservation of the honor and the elementary rights of the people." It then goes on to say that "the Congress is pledged, under Gandhi-ji's leadership, to Non-Violence for the vindication of India's freedom", and "therefore requests him to guide the Congress in the action that should be taken"; because the Poona resln. "has lapsed."

Another resolution passed at Poona on the *previous* day, 27-7-1940, confirmed the W. Cttee.'s (Wardha) Statement of 21-6-1940, reiterated its opinion that, as explained in that stt., "the Congress must continue to adhere strictly to the principle of *Non-Violence* in the Struggle for Independence," and that "it is *unable* in the present circumstances to *decide* that the principle should be extended to *free India's National Defence*..." It went so far, however, in its wish to make concession to M. Gandhi's views, that it concluded the resolution thus: "...All Congress volunteers are bound by their pledge to remain non-violent...Any *other* volunteer organisation for the purpose of *self-defence*, with which Congressmen are associated, must likewise adhere to non-violence." This resolution, of 27-7-1940, was *confirmed* by the Bombay resolution of 15-9-1940.

The Delhi resolution (7-7-1940), which the Poona resolution of 28-7-1940, confirmed, said: "...The acknowledgement by Britain of Complete Independence of India is the only solution of the problems facing both Britain and India;... such an unequivocal declaration should be immediately made, and that, as an immediate step in giving effect to it, a *provisional National Government* should be constituted at the centre, which, though...transitory.. should be such as to command the confidence of the elected elements in the Central Legislature, and secure the closest co-operation of responsible Government in the provinces...Unless (this is done) all efforts at organising the material and moral resources of the country for defence cannot in any sense be voluntary...(But) if these measures are adopted, it will enable the Congress to throw in its full weight in the efforts for the effective organisation of the defence of the country".

As this might not satisfy M. Gandhi, the Bombay resln. goes on to say : "In view of certain misapprehensions that have arisen in regard to the Congress *policy* of Non-Violence, the A.I.C.C. desires to make it clear that this continues", and that "this Cttee. firmly believes in the *policy* and practice of Non-violence, not only in the struggle for Swaraj, but also, *in so far as this may be possible* of¹ application in a free India. The Cttee. is convinced, and recent world events have demonstrated, that complete World Disarmament is necessary, and the establishment of a *New and Juster Political and Economic Order*, if the world is not to destroy itself and revert to barbarism. A free India will therefore throw all her weight in favor of World Disarmament, and should herself be prepared to give a lead in this to the world. Such lead will inevitably *depend on external factors and internal conditions*, but the State would *do its utmost* to give effect to this policy of Disarmament. Effective Disarmament and the establishment of World-Peace...*depend* ultimately on the Removal of the Causes of Wars and National Conflicts. To that end India will peacefully labor. (India's) freedom will be the prelude to the close association with other countries, within a Comity of Free Nations, for the Peace and Progress of the World".

The W. Cttee. resln. of August, 1940, adopted at Wardha, notes "with deep regret that the British Government have

After the Bombay resolution (15-9-1940), Shri Rajagopalachari wrote a letter to Mahatma-ji (*Harijan*, 29-9-1940) defending the Poona resolution of 28-7-1940. At Poona, Shri Rajagopalachari, as also Pt. Jawaharlal and others, had maintained stoutly and cogently that no Government, no State, could be run without army and police. The discussion was not wholly academic; because the 'practical' problem of preparing India for self-defence was and is involved. If Britain should be overwhelmingly defeated in this war (which God forbid), and should any other foreign power then invade this unhappy country, the people would perforce *have* to follow M. Gandhi's prescription of Non-Violent Submission to it; or, in the words of the late Bhupendra Nath Basu, on a question by the then Governor of Bengal, "Present an address of welcome to it, as we have been doing to you".

¹The words are taken from *Hindustan Times*, 16-9-1940. If we read, 'for' instead of 'of', the meaning would be clear.

rejected," (by their pronouncement of Aug. 8) "the friendly offer and practical suggestion contained in the Poona resln..."; says that the British Govt.'s attitude of hostility towards the legitimate claims of India, hostility based on the objections of 'dissentient groups', 'of princes', and of 'foreign vested interests', "is a direct incitement to civil discord and strife, and amounts to a fatal blow to all willingness to compromise and adjustment of claims...The W. Cttee. cannot but conclude that the attitude and assertions contained in these statements, made on behalf of the British Government, confirm the prevailing feeling that the British authority has been continually operating so as to create, maintain, and aggravate differences in India's national life..."

The Spirit of Honorable Compromise.

These extracts have been made at such length for two reasons. They are a valuable re-statement of fundamental Congress views. They also show M. Gandhi's willingness to accept 'honorable compromise,' even when matters of 'inexorable principle' are involved. The resolutions were drafted by Pt. Jawaharlal (?). They steer skilfully between Scylla and Charybdis; the Scylla of alienating M. Gandhi and forfeiting his co-operation and guidance by too strong insistence that Non-Violence is *only* a right *Policy* in India's struggle with the British Govt.; and the Charybdis of having to break pledges afterwards, by a too unconditional acceptance, now, of the doctrine that Non-Violence is an *inviolable Principle*, which must be followed always, in-depend-ently of all times, places, circumstances; so that a free India would be bound to do *without* army and police; would be bound to check *goondas*, criminals, aggressors, invaders, by merely reciting to them M. Gandhi's high spiritual precepts. To say that a Government can be carried on without army and police, is to say that Millennium has come, that that Golden Age, that Satya-Yuga, which is always in the past or in the future, never in the present, has arrived, and Society can carry itself on *without any government* at all. The 'State will have withered away' then, as the Marxists and 'idealist an-archists' hope.

The italicised words, in the quotations, embody the skill of avoidance of both calamities. Mahatma-ji is much too shrewd to have been deceived; he was also much too 'practically' benevolent, and patriotic to reject an honorable compromise. He therefore graciously accepted the 'semblance' or 'substance' of submission, offered by the A.I.C.C. He has

always been great on 'the right formula', 'the right words', which will soothe the ruffled feathers of the minds of both parties ; and will partly (if not wholly, which is never possible) satisfy both. Jawaharlal managed to find the right formula in this case. He also put in the Crying Need for a New World Order, for which the whole world is craving ; but in which Mahatma-ji is not interested. He believes in 'One step enough for me'. The whole world may agree with him in these words, too, if the 'one step' is understood as the very great step of a 'New Rational World Order'. *That* 'one step' would satisfy all—except the *Power-mad*. Otherwise, 'one step' is right policy for the *feet* ; while a 'thousand steps ahead' is scarcely enough for the *eyes* ; both feet and eyes are indispensable ; *eyes* must *lead feet* towards the *clearly seen right goal*.

Thus, there is every reason to believe that 'the Substance of Independence' would still be the equivalent of 'Complete Independence', to M. Gandhi, today and any day ; especially as 'Complete Independence' is verily a 'Complete Myth'. No individual, group, nation, country, can ever possibly be 'completely independent of others'. The above interpretation of M. Gandhi's mental attitude is of course only an inference from his various speeches, actions, and general conduct of affairs.

Apparent inconsistencies of M. Gandhi, due to the same Desire for Honorable Compromise.

The following may be adduced further, in justification of the inference. In his reply, 25-4-1941, (*H. Times*, 27-4-1941), to Mr. Amery, M. Gandhi says : "Mr. Amery, in utter disregard of truth, misleads his audience that the Congress wants 'all or nothing'. Let me remind him that, in order to placate British sentiment, the Congress *descended* to the Poona resolution (28-7-1940), and when at Bombay (15-9-1940), it undid the Poona resolution, I *authoritatively stated* that the British Government *could not*, at the *present moment* grant or *declare India's Independence*, and that, therefore, for the time being, we should be satisfied with complete freedom of speech and pen. Was that 'all or nothing'?..."

In a statement, d/ 6-3-1941, M. Gandhi says : "I must warn the public against journalistic flights of imagination... It is a gross misrepresentation to suggest that the Congress is out for securing terms for itself. Freedom of speech is for all, even as independence will be for all...Strong objection has been raised to *my interpretation* of the Bombay resln. I regard it as a true interpretation. But it is that of an *indi-*

vidual. I have no authority from the Congress to interpret or vary the Congress resolutions. That is essentially the function of the President, the Wkg. Cttee., and finally the A.I.C.C. The only authority I have is to conduct the campaign of Civil Disobedience. But when the time for settlement comes, it will be for the Wkg. Cttee. to decide what the terms shall be. My contribution will be confined to advising the Cttee. The Wkg. Cttee. may reject the interpretation I have given it, or the A.I.C.C. may even alter the resolutions they have passed. Meanwhile, let everyone, whether Congressman or others, be guided by the Bombay resolution, and not by my interpretation. I have therefore failed to understand the consternation created by my statement that there can be no settlement short of independence, during the pendency of the war."

As M. Gandhi has "failed to understand the consternation created by" his statement, so the present writer, with many others, has failed to understand the precise and full significance of each of his two statements, of 25-4-1941 and 6-3-1941, quoted above; or to see the same thought consistently running through both; or why there should be any consternation in any intelligent mind at all, and any need for M. Gandhi to give an explanation, if his position, speech, and actions, were so unmistakeable as he says they were. On 6-3-1941, he said, "there can be no settlement short of independence, during the pendency of the war"; on 25-4-1941, he said, "I authoritatively stated that the British Government could not, at the present moment, grant or declare India's independence." The two statements seem difficult to reconcile.

But this writer can reconcile them by supposing that there is a subtle fluidity, unfixability, in the thought; which fluidity is the result of that perpetual *readiness for honorable compromise*, which M. Gandhi has expressly avowed from time to time, and which is a perfectly right and very desirable attitude of mind, for every one; the adjective 'honorable' being duly borne in mind. 'Life is a perpetual choice between two evils'; 'Life is a give-and-take'; this means only that Life is an incessant compromise, a middle course, between opposite extremes. In the present case, Complete Independence is one irrational and impossible extreme; Utter Dependence is the other irrational and impossible extreme; *Inter-dependence* is the rational middle course. Such equal *Inter-dependence* means 'the Substance of Independence' or 'genuine Dominion Status'. Were it not so, a Generalissimo's 'individual inter-

pretation', which would ordinarily be an 'authoritatively stated' command, could scarcely be said by that same Generalissimo to be open to rejection by his *subordinates*; for President, W. Cttee.; and A.I.C.C. of the Congress, surely are such, so far as the conduct of the present Satyagraha movement and its aim are concerned. Though the immediate, specific, limited aim is to secure 'freedom of speech and pen', is this aim not a merely *inter-mediate* aim, which is itself a means to the further and ultimate aim of the 'freedom of Self-government'? Is M. Gandhi, being such a Generalissimo, like an ordinary paid General, who has only to carry out the wishes of the Civil Government, f.i., to besiege and storm and seize a particular fortress held by the enemy, irrespective of his private political views as to whether the Civil Government's wishes are right or wrong, what the further purposes of that Government are in regard to the enemy, and whether those purposes are just or unjust? The mere fact that M. Gandhi parted company from the Congress over a question of principle, a question of conscience, proves amply that he cannot regard himself as a 'Generalissimo', and *also* be subject to the 'iron discipline' which may be imposed on him by his 'subordinates'. The italicised words in the quotations from his two statements bring out the anomalousness of his position clearly; a position of absolute power without any responsibility, which enables him to drive, what seem to the layman to be, patent self-contradictions, in pair-horse harness, at will.

Too much subtlety in a great leader's directions to his followers; perpetual mistakings of his meaning by them; too much need for continual explanations of his meaning; too much distinguishing between 'individual capacity' and 'Congressman capacity' and 'representative capacity' and 'plenipotentiary capacity'; these are scarcely good for the Cause.¹

¹In the course of his speech at the A. I. C. C. meeting in Bombay, on 15-9-1940, M. Gandhi, describing his interview with the Viceroy, said: "Although I spoke only for myself, *deep down in me there was the Congressman* speaking...He sent for me because he thought I would represent the Congress view, and I would be able to carry conviction to Congressmen. I withdrew from that position, not as an *individual* but as a *Congressman*, and because *I failed to carry conviction even to a single Congressman...*" (*Harijan*), 29-9-1940, p. 303). All these subtle distinctions are extremely puzzling.

A Digression—for a Relevant Suggestion.

No doubt, the method of the Non-Violent political struggle is new ; and mistakes are natural when treading a new path, in a jungle, in a desert, amidst hills, on the seas. Yet a beaconlight in the distance ; a compass in the hand ; helps to avoid many mistakes. The present writer has ventured often before, in newspaper articles, and in the previous portion of this book, to suggest why there is, to M. Gandhi's followers, such a baffling and con-fusing quality in his words and thought ; and also to suggest what that beacon-light, that compass, is, which would have helped him and his followers, in the past, and would help again in the future, to avoid what he has himself, with the exaggeration natural, on such occasions, to a saintly-minded penitent, called 'Himalayan blunders'. Those suggestions will be repeated here. There are some things which will bear, nay, which need, repetition, at regular intervals ; like healthy food ; like opening the windows to the morning sun.

The Ancient Wisdom.

Be it noted that, if this writer makes and repeats such suggestions, he does so, *not* out of any conceit of superior intelligence of his own, *but* out of a very humble and profoundly reverent belief in the incomparably and immeasurably Superior Wisdom of the Ancient Sages and Seers of India ; who saw Life whole—in all its Infinity and Eternity of beginnings and endings of cycles upon cycles ; who attained the clear Vision of the One Only Truth, viz., the Infinite and Eternal, Universal and Supreme, Self of all ; who perceived with all-encompassing Insight, the Laws of the Manifestation and Working of that Self in all Life ; and who have left instructions for the Organisation of Human Society in such fashion as will conduce best to 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number', or, in more modern phrasing, 'the greatest and most equitable spread of General Welfare'. M. Gandhi will surely be the first to acknowledge that Superior Wisdom ; he is a devotee of the *Bhagavad-Gita*.

Opponents who are not impressed by his spiritual quality, call them by harsh names. Of course, the reconciliation is that, as Shri C. Rajagopalachari said once in print (in 1939, perhaps), that though M. Gandhi is not 'a four-anna member' of the Congress, formally, since 1934, he is 'a sixteen-anna' (i. e. cent per cent) 'Congressman,' all the same.

The Great Lack.

This is not the place to reproduce in English, their Declarations on the subject, in detail, from the Samskr̥t in which they are enshrined. That has been done elsewhere. Here it is enough to say that the Beacon-light, the Compass, for lack of which, the Congress, with its Generalissimo and Generals and soldiers of high and low rank and degree, is erring away, again and again, from the straight path of steady advance, is a luminous and comprehensive Scheme of Swaraj, i.e., of Social Organisation, outlining policies for all the main departments of the administration of human affairs, individual and social. This is the Compass and the Light which is needed, not only by India but by all the countries of the World. For the lack of it, they are all rushing to and fro, in the dark, unable to find the Happiness they all seek; colliding against one another; mistaking friend for foe and foe for friend; and grappling with and trying frantically to slay each other. That which would be a Scheme of Swaraj for India; that same could be a Scheme of World Order, of World Organisation, of World Federation, *mutatis mutandis*, on a five times larger scale; for the whole of the Human World.

Clear, Accurate, Truthful Thought and Language.

Towards the close of his speech at Bombay on 15-9-1940, M. Gandhi said: "Let us be *clear* regarding the *language* we use and the *thoughts* we nurture. For what is language but the expression of thought? Let your *thought* be *accurate* and *truthful*, and you will hasten the advent of *Swaraj*, even if the whole world is against you.....*Freedom of speech* and pen is the *foundation* of *Swaraj*:" (*Harijan*, 29-9-1940, p. 306). In his closing speech on 16-9-1940, (extracted in *Harijan*, 22-9-1940, p. 291), he said, (apparently because some one had put a question on the point): "I am sorry that your mind has failed to grasp a very simple but a very important point that I made yesterday. I described the right of *free speech* as the *foundation-stone* of *Swaraj*. Let me explain this. I have yet to come accross a complete *definition* of *Swaraj*. I do not think I have been able to give it myself. I do not think even *Jawaharlal* has ever given it. It is possible that some one from among you may be able to give it, as it has often happened that others have defined for me things that I have been laboring for. If any one can do so, I shall gladly make him my Guru. But this resolution contains the seed of *Swaraj*..."

It is very depressing, that on 15-9-1940, M. Gandhi should exhort an audience of Congress leaders to be *clear* in *thought* and *language*, and ensure that their *thought* is *accurate* and *truthful*: and, on the next day, should have to confess that his own 'thought' as to the meaning of the word Swaraj—absolutely the most important word in the whole terminology or 'language' of the Congress, is not at all clear; is so hazy that he, the leader of leaders, cannot define it; that the next in leadership, Jawaharlal, too, has never defined it, and therefore, presumably, cannot define it. The 'thought' of Swaraj is the central, essential, fundamental, pivotal 'thought', on and around which the whole activity of the Congress revolves. *That* 'thought,' if any, should be *clear*, *accurate*, *truthful*, first and foremost, in the mind of *every* Congressman, even of the rank and file, much more of every leader. The mischievous consequences that have resulted from unclearness, inaccuracy, and therefore falseness and *conflicting variety*, in this thought, have been referred to, often, before; (see pp. 25, 59, and many others, *supra*).

It behoves M. Gandhi, the A. I. C. C., the W. Cttee., whatever else they may do, to first make their thought and language, clear, accurate, and truthful on this vital point. And it is not necessary at all for Mahatma-ji to seek for any new Guru. The *old* Sages and Seers have left for us all the instruction that is needed. Of course, these instructions are written in a language other than the spoken language of today; and their *ways* of expression are somewhat different from modern ways; so that literal translation might mislead; but the meaning is perfectly clear.

Abraham Lincoln's Definition of Swa-raj—as Corrected by the Ancients.

They declare that there are two Swa-s, 'selves', natures, in every living being; a 'higher' and a 'lower'; an altruistic and far-sighted, and an egoistic and short-sighted; rāj, government, by the 'higher Self', by the better, wiser, nature, i. e., by those in whom altruistic wisdom has subdued egoistic ignorance and error—that is real true Swa-raj, Self-government; all other rāj is false Swa-rāj, is *not* Swa-raj at all; to be under the rule of ignorant, erring, vicious egoists, whatever the color of their skin, whatever their religion or language or country, is to be under 'foreign' tyranny, under 'other-government'; (p. 52, *supra*). Therefore, Abraham Lincoln's famous definition of Self-government as "Government of the people, for

the people, *by* the people", has to be corrected, in the light of the Ancient Wisdom, by the substitution, for 'by the people' of such words as 'by the wisest, most experienced, most altruistic, most philanthropic and self-denying members of the People, trusted and elected by the people'. The question will arise, 'How to find the best and wisest?'. This has been answered before (see pp. 18, 29, 60-63, etc., *supra*.) As to what the detailed 'content' of Swa-raj should be, i. e., the Nature or shape of the Social Structure, in a *Society* and country where the 'Higher Self' of the People governs, this Structure has also been outlined clearly by the 'Best and Wisest' of the past ages, in India ; (see pp. 3, 77, 175, etc., *supra*). The *Principles* of it, being based on the Sciences of Psychology and Physiology, are as applicable to modern mankind, as they were to earlier ; the *details*, the *forms*, will of course vary from the older ones, because of the very great changes in the ways of living. These matters have been dealt with in greater detail elsewhere ; and may be further indicated in the last portion of this work. It should be noted that the most important function, generally speaking, in and of a Self-government, is Legislation. *This* must be done by the elected wisest and most philanthropic. Another point to note is that 'freedom of speech and pen' can scarcely be said to be the 'foundation-stone' of Swa-rāj ; it is undoubtedly one of the most important features, 'attributes', consequences, of Swa-rāj. The *foundation-stone*, or indeed, the whole structure, of True Swa-rāj is 'Enlightened, well-instructed, freedom of the People to *choose* wise, experienced, philanthropic Legislators', and 'Authority of the Legislature over the Executive'. Detailed guidance on all these matters is provided by the Ancient Wisdom¹. This does *not* mean that the Congress should perforce accept the Old Scheme and proclaim it to the world as the Indian Constitution it favors. Not at all. It only means that the Congress A.I.C.C. or W. C. should appoint a committee to prepare a draft of a constitution, *far better* than this Old Scheme, if they can ; for consideration and modification or complete rejection, by the W. C. and A. I. C. C., and by the

¹See this writer's *The Ethico-Psychological Orux in Political Science and Art ; Ancient vs. modern Scientific Socialism ; The Science of Social Organisation ; The Essential Unity of All Religions*, 2nd. edn., pp. 480-489, 625-628.

future Constituent Assembly ; and that this Cttee. should duly *consider* this *indigenous* Swa-dēshi Scheme *also*, while preparing this Draft.

How to Avoid Obscurities.

For the immediate purpose of freeing the Congress Generalissimo's directions from their perplexing obscurities and liabilities to misunderstanding, his attention may be invited to the Principle which pervades the Ancient Scheme, as governing the whole of Human Life, viz., that 'Duty varies with time, place, and circumstance,' or, more briefly, 'with Circumstance'; for 'Circumstance' includes the 'special conditions of time and place'.

It happens that there are two main 'Circumstances' in human life. The human being, normally, is and *should be* walking on the Path of Pursuit of the things of the senses, the things of this-world, (and turning away from the things of the 'other'-world ("trailing clouds of glory" from which we all come, in the words of the English poet), in the first half of life ; when his mind-body is growing and is maturing its outward-going powers ; powers which grasp the things of this-world more and more. In the second half of life, normally, (sub-consciously if not consciously), the person is and *should be* treading the Path of Renunciation of the things of this-world (and turning towards the things of the 'other'-world) ; developing 'inward'-seeing powers, which see and seize the things of the Spirit, more and more. The Duties (Dharma, Farz) of the Path of Pursuit (Pravṛtti-Mārga, Qaus-i-Nuzūl) are different from those of the Path of Renunciation (Nivṛtti-Mārga, Qaus-i-Urūj). Also, the Duties of Normal Times, (Sampat-Kāla, Waqt-i-Ḳhuslī-hāli), times of good-fortune, good-organisation, orderliness, are different from those of Abnormal Times, (Āpat-Kāla. Waqt-i-Musibat) times of mis-fortune, dis-organisation, dis-order-liness. There are endless applications in detail of these two broad, comprehensive, general principles.

Two Main Principles to bear in mind.

Mahatma Gandhi's followers specially, and the Indian public generally, would be saved much perplexity and error, if he would keep these Two very anciently-enunciated Principles before his own and the Public's Mind, constantly. He would then be able to say : 'I am a hermit, *sannyāsi*, *tārīk-ul-dunyā*, on the Path of Renunciation. *My* duty is unconditional Non-Violence, in all circumstances. I may not

defend myself, even against snakes, scorpions, wolves, tigers, by violent means. If and when I have developed soul-force enough, such ferocious animals will become docile, gentle, of themselves, as soon as they approach me. It is said so, clearly, in the old books on Yoga. A healthy cheerful person radiates health and cheerfulness. A sickly mopy creature infects others with sickness and melancholia. A soul steeped in tenderness will overpoweringly communicate that gentleness to even the ferocious, by the radiations, the 'radio-waves,' vibrations, of its 'subtle' mental body, *sukshma-sharira*, *jism-i-latîf*. If I fail to do so, it is only because I am very far from perfect. But you, who are not such *fagîrs*, who are householders, *khânā-dârs*, *grha-sthas*, your duty is different. Struggle for political freedom is the duty of those who are on the Path of Pursuit. I must not lift a hand against any one even in *self-defence*; but you may, and ought to, in the ways that *every law permits*. At the same time, in this particular struggle for Self-government, the Indian people *must* follow the Policy of Complete Non-Violence. Because, (1) in this country's present peculiar circumstances, *no other* policy is possible; (2) the whole world is already too full of Violence; even an *extreme* call to extreme Non-Violence may seem *justified* as a counter-measure; and it would set a beneficent and magnificent example if we could and did win our Cause by Non-Violence; *there is a chance* of our winning through, in this way, because (3) there is a strong nerve-strand of Conscience in the Better Part of the British Mind, in the shape of the great Labor Party and its leaders, which nerve-stand is working for our Cause all the time; and the ruling classes, too, of Britain, however egoist, imperialist, and nationalist, are not wholly without sensitiveness to World Opinion. While out-and-out Non-Violence is the Duty of the *sannyâsi*, it is not forbidden to him, to teach, to householders, their duties different from his own; nor is it forbidden to him to set the example of Non-Violence, by himself braving jail, etc., when necessary. In the case of rioters, robbers, incendiaries, murderers, who will not listen to mere appeals to be of good behaviour, it is the duty of you householders, to defend your dependents and yourselves, and resist criminals in any and every way you can, with whatever arms may be available, in accordance with the law of the land. Apart from those who are householders with dependents; if any persons are in a position to become Congress

volunteers, able to risk their lives as regular soldiers do, such persons would be in a different category ; they could be entrusted and charged with other duties, and would act like semi-*sannyāsīs*, political *sannyāsīs* of a special kind, in Abnormal Times ; they would be as 'soldiers' ; but *missionary* soldiers ; *not mercenary* soldiers'.¹ Advice like this would be something which probably every one could understand and act on, without uncomfortable doubts and feelings of 'inconsistency', and perplexity as to what to do in a given situation.

Precept and Example.

Talking among themselves, Congressmen have sometimes asked one another, why, when 'Example teaches more than Precept', the 'precept' as to Utter Non-Violence, in the presence of even murderous rioters, has not been illustrated and enforced with 'example' by any of the great Congress leaders who preach the precept. The explanation they give to one another, is, that probably none of these leaders *really* believes in the precept ; and, secondly, that if anyone does so believe, it is fortunate that he has not thought it worth while to follow up the precept by demonstration ; for that would have meant only the great loss to the country, of his very valuable leadership, valuable in other directions, such as maintaining the phenomenal awakening of the People, preventing them from going to sleep again, and preventing Violence from entering into their Struggle for Freedom. The futility of such non-violent self-sacrifice to rioters is evidenced by the martyrdom of Ganesh Shankar Vidyarthi in the Cawnpore Riots of 1931. And M. Gandhi himself has been more or less modifying his views, in this respect, since the latest outbreaks in Dacca, Ahmedabad, and Bombay itself, the capital of the Province of that name, as indicated before.

¹The writer made suggestions as above, ré Congress Volunteers, so long ago as 1920, when presiding over the annual U.P. Provincial Conference at Moradabad ; sent them again, in more detailed form, to the Gauhati Congress, in 1926 ; and has repeated them since, from time to time. M. Gandhi himself, too, has been advancing in this direction ; but hesitantly ; and without clear enunciation of the basic principles ; hence without steady effect. He has said, now and then, that 'a very few Congress workers or volunteers of the right *quality* are better than very many who have not that quality,' that

The Preventive of Inconsistency. Extremes and Mean.

It is true that M. Gandhi has said that he "learnt from Emerson, long ago, that 'Inconsistency is the hobgoblin of

'quality is much more necessary than quantity'; but he has not specified the needed quality intelligibly. Very recently however, he has said that 'only those should take up Satyāgraha who *are prepared to lose all.*' The statement came very late. More: it would be much better to say; '...who *have prepared* themselves, in such and such a way, especially by not taking up responsibilities for others, or, if they have taken up any, then by relieving themselves of them in a just and reasonable manner, after making due provision for dependents'. Extracts from the Scheme of a Volunteer Organisation, above referred to may be found in App. D, "Some Noteworthy Extracts".

A Note on Personal and Other Matters.

Proofs of pp. 273-288 came in from the press on 1-6-1941. On 2-6-1941, the writer was struck down with a very painful malady, not uncommon in old age, (the writer is in his seventy-third year), which, it now appeared, had been making way, unsuspected, insidiously, for many months, and had now come to a head. He was fully prepared for, indeed would have welcomed, release from his worn-out body; but was coward enough to shrink from agony, and desired a painless release, like that enviable one, by heart-failure. But the Mystery, without whose knowledge "not a sparrow falls", (as is written in the Scriptures), nor rises, nor an insect beats its wings and lives or dies, and Which at the same time directs the wheelings of the vast star-systems, decided that this particular handful of dust should continue to be attached to the soul. After three months in sick-bed, the writer is able to sit again at a table, for a while, and do some little work. His inner prompting, from that same Mystery, is to continue the work, however feebly and more and more imperfectly, which has been his unconscious or conscious 'mission in life', viz., 'To justify the Manu's way to men', to interpret the old Indian thought, on the *Principles* of Metaphysic and Psychology and Sociology as applicable and applied to practical Social Organisation of the Human Race. That is the mission which inspires the immediate thesis of this book. The writer must therefore try to wind up this book, anyhow, with the material of the so far unused portion of the articles referred to

fools'...". All the same, he is anxious, and rightly anxious, to avoid charges of inconsistency ; and often tries to explain away such charges. The frequency of such, however, shows the need for something sounder than Emerson's view. The Principle that 'Duty varies with Circumstance', if duly followed, makes all inconsistency impossible. It is not inconsistent to wear light clothing, in summer, and heavy, in winter ; to offer 'passive

in the f.n. on p. 1, and of various notes and drafts made before the illness began ; though unable to do it with any careful industry, because of the broken condition of his body. He sent the page-proofs, above-mentioned, to the press, with print-order, on 2-9-1941.

The book pleads, throughout, that the world's maladies will *not* be cured except by a New World Order, guided and inspired by a World Religion ; and it *suggests*, (*by no means insists*), that the *Principles* just mentioned have to govern these two, if they are to be successful. A Constitution, embodying a New Social Order, Social Organisation, has to be thought out, for India by the wisest Indians ; in consonance with a New World Order, for the whole world, which should be thought out by a Conference of the wisest and most philanthropic minds of all countries ; because all countries are now tied to each other. To put this thought before the public, the writer has been laboring for the last twenty years, or even, it may be said, forty, as the first edition of his first book, bearing on the subject, (though somewhat indirectly, viz., *The Science of the Emotions*), was published in 1900. He has been especially importuning the leaders of the Congress, since 1921, to place a Draft of a Constitution for India, before the public, for *discussion*, and *education of public opinion*, as *preparation* for the work of the desired future Constituent Assembly, whenever it might meet. So far, more or less in vain. But, from a letter received, in Aug. 1941, from Mahatma Gandhi, in reply to the writer's, he is very happy to understand that Mahatma-ji now accepts the suggestion that a Special Committee should be appointed by the W.C. or the A. I. C. C., to prepare the Draft. Unfortunately the appointment has to be postponed till the members of the W.C. and the A.I.C.C. return from jail, where they now are, because of their disapproval of imperialist wars. Extracts from the correspondence with Mahatmajī will be found in Appendix D, 'Some Noteworthy Extracts.'

resistance', 'civil disobedience', to an existing governmental regime, in order to reform it, change it for a better, and 'active resistance' to criminals.

It may be added here, that the writer wishes to confine the further text of this book, as much as possible, to events not later than 31-5-1941. If reference to a later occurrence is found necessary, it will usually be made in a foot-note. The most outstanding and most tremendous event of the last three months, is the invasion of Russia by Germany on 22-6-1941, and the shifting of the attentions of the latter, from Britain, to the former. As General Auchinlech has said, this has given a much-needed breathing space to Britain. Russia has been making an unexpectedly powerful resistance. Though the Germans have advanced far within her borders, yet she has so checked the speed of the Germans, that General Rain has come and General Winter is coming rapidly to her help, as they came before, against the rush of Napoleon. But Hitler is preparing to resist them, with the help of General Wood-(en) house(s), as Napoleon could not. So the War of Titans surges along a 2500 mile long front, from Arctic Sea to Black Sea, with some five million combatants engaged on each side. From 15-6-1940, when France accepted defeat, to 21-6-1941, the War lay between Britain and Germany; since then, it rages between Germany and Russia. The papers plainly indicated, for some weeks before 22-6-'41, that relations between Germany and Russia were getting strained, and great armies were being massed by both, along the boundary-line. In the absence of all clarification of the mystery of Rudolf Hess' visit to and imprisonment in Britain; one can only guess that Hitler became enraged with Stalin's lukewarm support and very insufficient supply to Germany, of food-stuffs, oil and other material, needed to keep up the war against Britain; and determined to try to seize these things by force, and also try to push on towards India, if possible, in accord with his openly proclaimed determination to strike at Britain wherever possible. 'Misfortune brings strange bed-fellows'. It was in the papers that Hitler tried to induce Britain to make peace with Germany and help her against Russia; and that the proposal was rejected, of course. 'Alliances' between any two of the three inherently conflicting Ideologies, 'Democratic Imperialism', 'Nazism', 'Bolshevism', can be only hypocritical and very temporary; like those recorded in the *Pancha-tantra* (see p. 147, 161, *supra*),

In short, between the Irrational extreme of Unconditional Non-Violence and the opposite Irrational extreme of Unconditional Violence, the Rational middle course is Defensive or Curative Violence, or 'Punishment'. The old Sanskrit books make clear discrimination between *himsā* (violence to, hurting of, the innocent) and *danda* (punishing of the guilty).

Mahatma-ji himself seems to have recognised the validity of this 'middle course' between Violence and Non-violence, in his statement d/ 15-9-1939 (*National Herald*, 17-9-1939), on the Wardha Statement d/ 14-9-1939, which has been summarised on pp. 22-24, *supra*. The sentences, relevant here, of that statement are, (see foot of p. 23, *supra*), "A free and democratic India will gladly associate herself with other free nations, for mutual *defence against aggression*, and for economic co-operation". 'Defence', here, obviously means 'Defensive Violence', 'Armed Defence'. Mahatmaji said further, in the statement, "I was sorry to find myself alone in thinking that whatever support was to be given to the British, was to be given *unconditionally*. This could be done *only* on a *non-violent* basis. But the Cttee. had a tremendous responsibility to discharge. It could *not* take a purely *non-violent* attitude. In stating the reasons for its conclusion, the Cttee. showed the greatest consideration for the English...I *hope* the statement will receive the unanimous *support* of all Congressmen. The strongest among them will not find any lack of strength in it, and at the supreme hour in the history of the nation, Congressmen should believe that there will be no lack of strength in *action*, if action should become necessary. It will be a pity if *Congressmen* engage in *petty squabbles* or *party strife*'...

between ichneumon, snake, cat, and vulture. All three can be reconciled simultaneously, and made healthy, lastingly, only by cutting off the extremist septic portions of each. Otherwise, though the danger has been diverted for the time, from Britain, (as the Russian papers say rightly), by the transference of Germany's wrath from Britain to Russia; yet, should Russia be defeated, Germany will attack Britain with redoubled force; or, should Germany be defeated, then Russia will war on Britain, some day, mightily. Lasting peace, for all three, and for the world, can be secured only by *Reconciling the Three Ideologies*, as suggested just now, and all through this book.

Another very outstanding event has been the occupation

All this seems to mean that though, when Mahatmaji said "unconditionally", he meant '*conditioned* by non-violence', (perhaps he meant only whole-hearted *moral* support); yet ultimately he accepted the W.C.'s view; which was indeed a very just, rational, and equitable view.

of Iran by Britain from the south and Russia from the north, each racing as it were to seize the largest part. This measure was 'necessary' to forestal Germany and prevent her advancing into Asia and towards India. Even so Germany found it 'necessary' to occupy the smaller European countries. The peace-minded majority in India has, no doubt, cause to welcome this safeguard against invasion from the north-west. But it is far from the end of the troubles of India, or the world.

Japan also has been occupying Indo-China, in the same way, is gathering forces there, and menacing Thailand, Burma, India; and is being held back, apparently, only by fear of U.S.A., which has now a very powerful fleet on the Pacific. Britain too has been strongly manning Singapore with the help of Australia; and Indian troops in large numbers, have been sent to Singapore and to Burma.

Another event, of special significance for India, is that in his speech (*Hindustan Times*, 11-9-1941), Mr. Churchill stated plainly that the eight-point agreement, which he had arrived at with Pt. Roosevelt, at their secret meetings on the Atlantic, in August, 1941, and in which hopes of 'a better order of things' are held out to *all* oppressed countries—that that agreement "*does not qualify in any way* the various statements of *policy* which have been made from time to time about the developement of constitutional government in India, Burma, and other parts of the Empire." He refers particularly to "the declaration of Aug. 1940,...to help India...to equal partnership in the British Commonwealth,...*subject*, of *course*,...to (our) obligations...and responsibilities to its (India's) many creeds, races, and interests." So India need not foster fondly any false hopes; though an earlier speech by Cabinet Minister Attlee clearly indicated that India was also covered by the agreement. How the "obligations and responsibilities" have been discharged, becomes patent when we compare the 'progress' made by India during the last 150 years of British rule, with that made by the British and Japanese people during half, and the Russian people during a sixth, of that period.

It has been said before that M. Gandhi has, now and then, admitted, in public writing, that a Swaraj Govt. would have to maintain some Army and some Police for preserving internal peace and order; and his view as regards *training of the people for self-defence* has also been quoted before, (pp. 248-9).

It is said that, over the resignation, in Novr, 1939, of Ministry by the Congress; the subsequent commencement, in Oct. 1940, of Satyagraha; the withdrawal of Congressmen from even the Central Legislature, where they could have continued to function as a strong Opposition, keeping perpetually alive the protest against the prosecution of an Imperialist War which professes as object, the ensuring of 'Freedom', while India is kept in 'Bondage'—it is said that there were many discussions and differences among the members of the High Command before the views of the resignationists and Satyagrahis prevailed. After witnessing the march of events, and spending long periods in jail, it has been said, (to this writer, in Aug.-Sep. '41), by Congressmen released from jail, that there is a chaos of opinions among the Congress-prisoners, that very many of them feel that the steps taken by the High Command, have resulted in only futile waste of time, vitality, health, livelihood, property, (especially of the household goods of the poorer, seized and auctioned for realisation of fines); and that the Congress should take up Ministerial office and Legislature-work again. Shri S. Satyamurti and some other leading Congressmen have been publicly advocating this course, since August, 1941. But the choice no longer rests, it seems, with the Congress; it now rests with the Government. Others, mostly those who have not gone to jail, say that the new Satyagraha, etc., have a great symbolical moral value, as proving to the world, the sincerity of the protest of the Congress against an Imperialist War which talks of freedom but continues to keep India in serfdom. -

The 'middle course' in this case, would perhaps have been for the Congress Ministries to have declared: 'The Army and War have been kept out of our province of work by the new Government of India Act. We will therefore have nothing to do with the War-effort. We will *neither hinder it nor help*. The Governor-General and the provincial Governors may do whatever they think fit to promote the war. After having declared our adherence to the Wardha Statement, we shall confine ourselves to the functions that have been

assigned to us by the Act.' The Congress Party in the Central Legislature could have similarly gone on functioning as an Opposition, and periodically voicing the Congress protest against the War. This course would probably have been the most beneficent to India, in present conditions. The Congress Nationalist Party in the Central L. Assembly has been actually following this course, under the leadership of Shri M.S. Aney. Secessions from the Congress Party and accessions to the Congress Nationalist Party, are increasing. The Maharashtra province has always given its heart-and-head allegiance to the late Loka-mānya B. G. Tilak, profound scholar and author of international fame, deeply versed in both Samskr̥t and English learning, ardent recklessly self-sacrificing patriot, whose simple, straightforward publicly avowed policy was 'Responsive Co-operation', 'Be good to the good, and diplomatic and hard to the crooked and hard, (*Shatham praśi shatham kuryāt, s-ādaram praśi s-ādaram* ; which is better than the policy of the Western Powers, 'Diplomacy always'), 'Take what you get, and strive for more'. Ordinary human beings, mostly, and especially the British men in power, while clinging to power all they can, still believe in a *gradual* slow devolution of it and parting with it to others, as the result of a steady strong tug by the others ; but they object to and resist with all their might, any sudden snatching. There is no doubt that Mahatma-ji's shock-tactics have had very great and very good use ; but that use would have been much greater and better, would not have been ruined by the uncurbed lower 'swa' of Congressmen, if those tactics had been combined with the Loka-mānya's policy, by means of a tentative Draft Swaraj-Constitution. The Congress-Swaraj-Party which was formed at the Gaya Congress of 1922, under the leadership of Pt. Motilal Nehru and Deshbandhu C.R. Das, and for the *consideration of which the latter drafted a Constitution*, was a move in the right direction ; that Party went into the Legislatures in 1923.; but naturally merged back into the Congress, when the latter, as a whole, took up the Parliamentary policy in 1926.

As to "petty squabbles or party strife", which Mahatmaji deprecates—he has often publicly condemned much worse things among Congressmen, corruption, falsehood, intriguing, jealousies, excessive personal ambitions, etc., as bad as any among Government servants. It is *these* which have ruined the prestige of the Congress, sterilised its efforts, blocked its

progress. And these, in turn, are due to the failure of the Congress leaders to *educate* Congressmen and the public in the *meaning*, implications, policies, 'content', of Swa-raj, by the prime means of a Draft Constitution.

Finally, we may note that between the 'extreme' *Truth* of the One Only Universal Self (or Spirit) and the 'Extreme' *Falsehood* of the Many Not-Self (or Matter), the Mean is Comparative or *Relative Truth*, 'As if'; (for illustration, see p. 217, *supra*). The 'Extreme' Truth, and the 'Extreme' Falsehood, are Un-speak-able, except by Silence. All that is spoken, is 'relative', not 'absolute', not ab-solv-ed from limitations and conditions.¹

So too, the golden mean, the right middle course between the wrong extremes of Complete Independence and Utter Dependency, the only rational relationship, is that of the equal *Inter-dependence*, of all the component States, in a British-Indian and a World Commonwealth; and, as said repeatedly before, the present writer believes strongly that this is M. Gandhi's heart's desire still and always, so far as the relationship between Britain and India is concerned

**The Views of some Other important Political Parties
and Leaders of India re' the Meaning of
'Independence'.**

A Conference was held at Bombay, on 14th and 15th March, 1941, under the chairmanship of the Rt. Hon'ble Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru. In the published *Proceedings*, it is described as a "Non-Party Political Conference". A supplementary pamphlet, entitled *A National Government, Answers to Criticisms*, publishes the Resolution, unanimously passed, and the memorandum sent by Sir T. B. Sapru to H. E. the Viceroy. The subjoined extracts are from these.

The Memo says that (though it is described as a Non-Party Conference, yet), "The Bombay Conference can fairly claim to have been representative of India outside the Congress and the Muslim League...It included the leaders of the Hindu Mahasabha, the Congress National Party, the Hindu League, the Liberal Party, the Sikhs, the Indian Christians, the Parsis, and the Scheduled Castes, besides representatives of the Landed Aristocracy, and of Commerce and Industry, and a number of persons who had been Members of Govern-

¹For exposition, of the meta-physics of these statements, see the writer's *The Science of Peace*.

ment at the Centre and in the Provinces...It represented very adequately that important section of British India's population which recognises that the *defeat of England spells ruin to India*, and which, therefore, feels that in this War it is essential so to readjust the central machinery of Government as to produce the necessary psychological effect on the people and evoke their whole-hearted co-operation in the war effort...The Resolution confines itself to a re-construction of the Central Government during the period of the war. It in no way prejudices what the ultimate Constitution of India will be, how it will be framed, and how the different claims, interests, and points of view will be reconciled to produce a workable scheme of Government. Secondly, the reconstructed Central Government is to continue to be responsible to the Crown, thus securing the stability of the Government during the war period."

The Resolution says, "...This Conference is of opinion that the *whole Executive Council* should consist of *non-official Indians* drawn from important elements in the public life of the country;...(but) so far as the Defence is concerned, the position of the Commander-in-Chief...may not in any way be prejudiced...In regard to all inter-imperial and inter-national matters, the reconstructed Government should be treated on the *same footing as the Dominion Governments*....It is necessary to remove the *doubts and misgivings* of the people of this country as regards the *genuineness* of the *intentions* of His Majesty's Government, by making a *Declaration, simultaneously* with the reconstruction of the Government, that within a *specified time limit* after the conclusion of the War, India will enjoy the *same measure of freedom* as will be enjoyed by *Britain and the Dominions*".

It should be particularly noted that the resolution was carried unanimously.¹

¹Thirty-four leaders attended the Conference : Sir T. B. Supru (the present doyen of the Liberal Party) ; Sir N. N. Sircar (Law member, Govt. of India, 1934-39) ; Sir Jagdish Prasad (I.C.S., retired, Education and Health Member, Govt. of India, 1935-40) ; Dr. R. P. Paranjpye (Member, India Council, 1927-32, Vice-Chancellor, Lucknow University, 1932-38) ; Sir P. Thakurdas, business magnate, Delegate, Round Table Conference, 1930-33) ; Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtoola, Esq. (President,

From the above extracts it should be fairly clear that, in essence, there is no *real* difference, as regards the *Objective*, (though there is much, as to *methods* of struggle), between Mahatma-ji and the Congress, on the one hand, and, on the other, these leaders and 'representatives' of the most important Parties of India, excepting the Congress and the Muslim League, (though for 'technical' reasons, they said they were there in their 'individual' capacities, in accordance with the rules of 'propriety' and 'correctness', to leave a way open for 'retreat', as far-seeing military commanders always do, should such 'retreat' unfortunately become necessary). As regards what Freedom, or Independence, or Substance of Independence, means, both mean "*the same freedom* as that of *Britain* and the *Dominions*." What difference there is, in this connection, relates only to words and some details, as to time-limits, etc.

Indian Tariff Board, 1935, M. L. A. Central, 1925-30); Mr. Chunilal B. Mehta (President of Bombay Shroffs Asscn, Indian Stock Exchange, and Indian Merchants' Chamber, Pdt., Fedn. of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, 1941); Sir Jogendra Singh (Sikh, Minister of Agriculture, Punjab, 1926-37, Member of Indian Taxation Enquiry Commission, Army Indianisation and Skeen Cttees.); Sir Cowasjee Jehangir (Member, Bombay Executive Council, 1921-22 and 1923-28, Delegate, R. T. Confces., 1930-32, M.L.A., Central); Hon. Sir Suleman Cassim Mitha (Member, Council of State); Rao Bahadur G. A. Natesan (Member, Tariff Bd, 1933, Sheriff of Madras, 1938); Sir K. N. Haksar (Dele., R. T. Confces., 1930-32, Secy.-Genl. of the Ind. States Delegh. to the R. T. Confces., Political Member, Gwalior State, 1912-37); Sir A. B. Dalal (retd. I. C. S., Director and Partner, Tata and Sons); Sir Sultan Chinoy, Founder, Indian Radio and Cable Communications, Mayor of Bombay, 1938-39, Director, Reserve Bk. of India, Bombay Bd.); Maharajadhiraj of Burdwan, G. C. I. E., K. C. S. I., K. C. I. E., Mem., Bengal Exec. Cl., 1919-24, Indian Delegate to Imperial Confce., London, 1926); Mr. V. A. Chandavarkar, (Christian, Chairman, Bombay Mill-owners Asscn., Mayor of Bombay, 1932-34, V. C., Bom. University, 1933-39, Prdt. Natl. Lib. Fedn. of India); Mr. M. S. Aney (M.L. A. Central, 1924-30 and, since 1935, Leader, Cong. Natlt. Party in Cen. L.A., Pdt., Hindu League); Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, M.L.A., Bom., Delegate, R. T. Confce. 1930-32 and Jt. Parliamentary Cttee., 1933. Depressed Classes leader. Professor): Sir Chimanlal

It seems desirable to extract here, out of the Proceedings, some noteworthy points made by the speakers. Sir N. N. Sircar, in the course of the long and exhaustive speech which he made in moving the Resolution, said: "...Before 1939, H. M.'s Govt. had never taken up the attitude—No agreement, no constitutional advance...The words of the Prime Minister (Mr. Ramsay Macdonald), uttered when the members of the second R. T. Confce. were dispersing after having recorded their failure to come to an agreement...were, 'This is a problem for you to settle among yourselves. The first of the burdens and privileges of a self-governing people is to *agree on the democratic principles to be applied*, (and ?) *how the democratic principles are to be applied*. This Conference has twice essayed the task and twice it has failed. If you cannot present us with a settlement acceptable to all parties,

Sitalvad (Mem. Exec. Cl., Bom., 1921-23, V. C., Bom. University, 1917-29); Sir J. P. Srivastava (Edn. Minister, U.P., 1931-37, Fin. and Industries Minister, U.P., 1937); Sir Maharaj Singh (Christian, retd. C. S., Ag. Genl. to Govt. of India in S. Africa, 1932, Mem. Exve. Cl., U.P., 1935, M.L.A., U.P.); Mr. K. Srinivasan (Mg. Editor, *The Hindu*, Madras); Mr. V. D. Savarkar, (President, Hindu Maha Sabha); Dr. B. S. Moonje (Vice-President, H. Maha Sabha, Del., R. T. Confce. 1930-32, ex-M. L. A. Central); Dr. Syama Prasad Mukherjee, Working-President, H. Maha Sabha, M. L. A., Bengal, ex-V. C., Calcutta University); Hon. Pt. Hriday Nath Kunzru (President, Servants of India Society, Member, Council of State); Mr. D. G. Dalvi (Member, Liberal Party, Bombay); Sardar Balwant Singh (Sikh); Mr. Ganpat Sahai; Raja Maheshwar Dayal Seth (M. L. A., U. P.); Sirdar Sant Singh (Sikh, M. L. A., Cen.); Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari (M. L. Council, Madras); Maharaja of Parlakimedi (Member, Royal Commission on Agriculture, Del. R. T. Confces. 1930-32; M. L. A., Orissa); Mr. B. Shiva Rao (Mem. R.T. Confces. 1930-32; Spl. Correspondent at Delhi and Simla of *The Hindu* and the *Manchester Guardian*); Sir Gokulchand Narang (ex-Minister, Punjab, leading Member of the H. M. Sabha, M. L. A., Punjab). Many of the above-named, whose Party is not specified, may be taken as members of the Liberal Party, or as in sympathy with its views; messages of good-will were received from fifteen leaders of note, from all parts of the country, by the Confce.; their names are given in the Introduction to the *Proceedings*.

in that event H. M.'s Govt. would be compelled to apply a provisional scheme, for they are determined that even these differences shall not be permitted to bar progress'...In 1939, the attitude of the British Govt. had completely changed, in as much as mutual agreement was to be a condition precedent to any constitutional change...Is there any important provision in the Act which is the result of substantial agreement between the parties? What about joint and separate electorates? These, as well as other important matters, were the subject of intense disagreement between the parties, but in spite of that, the Govt. of India Act was enacted.. (It could not have been) if H.M.'s Govt. had insisted on substantial agreement between the parties, on the material issues involved... Very different ideas of the importance of these organisations (the Congress and the Muslim League) prevail in different situations—so far as H. M.'s. Govt. is concerned...When it is said that India is with Britain during the War, the non-co-operation of the Muslim League is not taken into serious account at all; but in the matter of constitutional advance, the Muslim League is synonymous with 90 millions of Moslems. Just as in the case of the Congress, the Muslim League is treated as a giant or a dwarf, dependent on the occasion¹...The *four-and-a-half crores* of Momens, as also the Shiahhs, the Ahrars, etc., do not count at all.² I very strenuously

¹To make a mountain of a mole-hill or a mole-hill of a mountain, to try to show that black is white or white is black, to advocate entirely opposite views on different occasions, in different cases, is the perpetually practised and 'licensed' trick of lawyers and diplomats; as is well-known, yet submitted to, by the public.

²These remarks may be supplemented by an extract from a speech at Poona, on 1-8-1941, by the Rt. Hon'ble Mr. R. Jayakar (ex-Judge of the Federal Court, Delhi, ex-Member of the Judl. Cttee. of the Privy Council, London): "The Govt. of India Act is not the outcome of an agreement between the major communities. It was foisted on India irrespective of their wishes. And what, may I ask, happened to the Memorandum presented *unanimously* by the Indian Delegation collaborating with the Jt. Plty. Cttee. in 1933, in which several amendments were suggested to the proposed Bill, for the purpose of making it more acceptable to Indian sentiment? Every section of the Ind. Delgn. put its signature

oppose the assumption that the Congress and the League would oppose the new Govt." (After giving instances of conflicting views within the M. League, of Premiers and Ministers of the three non-Congress provinces who were whole-heartedly helping the war-effort, though they were members of the M League whose President was emphatically against such help ; he went to say) "...I cannot prevent my statements from being twisted into an 'attack' on the Congress ; but my whole object in referring to this matter is for leading to the conclusion that it would be extremely rash for any one to say how the Congress will behave if the demands put forward in the resolution are granted ..I refer you to the following facts... In March 1939, at Tripuri, the Congress condemned and strongly disapproved of British foreign policy of submitting to the Nazis ; and before this they had already condemned Britain for not fighting Japan who was the aggressor in China. They condemned Britain for not attacking Italy in the Abyssinian War ; so that up to that stage the complaints were, not of Britain's non-violence, but of their not being sufficiently violent...The Congress having declared this war to be an imperialist War, called upon the Congress members of the Assembly to withdraw from it ; yet later the complaint was that they had not been consulted, and that the War had been imposed on India without consulting them. They had prejudged the issue by declaring the War to be imperialist ; they had made consultation impossible by withdrawing Congress members : and yet later the complaint was that they had not been consulted. Within three days after the declaration of War, Pt. Nehru said—I am giving you his exact words—"I

from the Aga Khan to Sir H. Carr, the representative of European Commerce, everyone agreed—the representatives of Hindus, Muslims, Parsis, Christians, the Scheduled Classes, etc. When it was presented to Sir Samuel Hoare, it caused great surprise. What happened to it ? If the Brit. Govt. (says now that it) is willing to give India whatever the two major parties agree upon...one feels *distrustful* whether it (the promise) will be acted upon, (even) if such a consummation is ever reached...The only escape from this deadlock appears to be in the direction of the Mahatma slackening his resolve 'to carry on the Satyagraha for another five years'...The deadlock is causing harm only to the Hindus. The provinces with Muslim majority are functioning as usual..."

should like India to play her full part and throw all her resources into the struggle.' Four days later he repeated in his statement that 'the leaders of India all are on the side of democracy', and 'I have appealed to all Indians to throw all their resources into the common struggle against Nazism'... In Sep. 1940, M. Gandhi, in the *Harijan*, said, 'This is not the time to press the issue of independence, when the independence of Britain is at stake'.. I will add two more statements of his. According to the first, 'The defeat of Britain and France will be a calamity. If the Allies are defeated, India will be thrown into confusion and anarchy and may be disintegrated and fall a prey to foreign invasion'. The second stt. was, 'The Satyagraha campaign has for its object, the extortion of a declaration from the British Govt., that the Congress can go on preaching anti-War propaganda, go on preaching non-cooperation with Govt. in their War-efforts'. The latest attitude of the Congress, as represented by its leader, is, 'Every Britisher, man, woman, and child, would (? should) allow himself or herself to be slaughtered; whatever they (the Germans) want, give them, let them take it'...If Ram Chandra had followed this doctrine of the 'highest morality', he would not have offered concentrated violence on the demon who took away his wife...The chairman has remarked that being fresh from the Govt. of India, I ought to be able to throw some light on its working during recent years...I am under oath not to divulge any Cabinet secret...but you are entitled to draw such inferences as you like from the Rules of Business of the Govt. of India, which provide that for certain purposes, *a (single) member and the Governor-General* are to be taken as the *Govt. of India*...Whether the transfer of power will be real or not, will depend on who are chosen for the enlarged Council...If you put in some 'rabbits' to make up the requisite number, then, of course, the position will be very different...In offering the suggestion that the Council should be enlarged, we have taken good care not to indicate what proportions should be given to Hindus, Muslims, or others...We ought to be quite content if the total number to which the Council is to be expanded, and the allocation of different interests in it, are left to the discretion, sense of justice, and fair play, of the Governor-General. We are making a demand, not for the Hindu, or the Muslim, or the Sikh, or the Depressed Classes Community, but for India as a whole...The present policy of drift (of the Govt.) is tending to increase and intensify the differences

between the different communities...It has been stated in the resolution that India should not take advantage of Britain's difficulties in her heroic struggle...I would like to supplement this by saying that equally England should not exploit or take undue advantage of our difficulties..It is said that Indians...unjustly doubt the sincerity of H. M's Govt...Repeated promises subject to conditions which cannot be fulfilled,...(are) responsible for such suspicion...*Suspicion breeds suspicion*. Can H. M.'s Govt. say that they have no suspicion of Indians?"

Let us see now what Sir Jagdish Prasad says: "...It is one of the main purposes of this Conference to bring home to the Brit. Govt., that a Govt. of India, *predominantly official* and with a minority of Indians, is ill suited to evoke that willing effort, that sustained enthusiasm, even when things are going none too well, that are essential if India is to play a decisive part in victory...*Phrases* about the danger of *swapping horses in mid-stream*¹ will not allay political discontents...While we are supposed to be a great industrial country, the *manufacture* of a *bicycle* has so far been *beyond our resources*...It is of the utmost importance that a more active policy of industrialisation should form an essential part of a programme of post-war reconstruction, which should be taken in hand now...*If* the Central Govt. had begun to function as envisaged in the Govt. of India Act of 1935, the *whole Govt.* would have been *Indian* in composition and *responsible* to the *Legislature*...Is their role (i. e., of the leaders of the Sikhs, Parsis, H. M. Sabha, Cong. Natlt. Party, the Scheduled Castes, the Indian Christians, the Aristocracy of commerce, land, and industry, the Liberals), only to do what they are told by an *irresponsible* and sometimes an *unimaginative bureaucracy*? We are asked to impale ourselves on the horns of this dilemma, viz., Those whom Govt. regard as representative Indians make demands which cannot be conceded because they are unreasonable; those who make reasonable demands are unrepresentative...

¹Such phrases are part of the stock-in-trade of Diplomacy; like the one about 'favorable atmosphere'. Britain has been changing her Prime Minister, and other Ministers, over and over again, and passing lightning legislation, 'socialising' British private property and labor, in the midst of this war. See pp. 105-107, *supra*, on 'Emergency Socialism'.

The fundamental issue between the Govt. and the People is the transfer of political power...".¹

Sir Maharaj Singh said: "...Those of us who belong to political parties have, no doubt, come here in our *individual capacities*, but that does not mean that we can forget our party background...Ours is a very representative Conference... As far as my Party (the Indian Christian) is concerned...we are out to promote any effort that will secure *real and effective control of the Central Govt.*"²

Mr. V. N. Chandavarkar: "We (Indian Christians) now number something like seven or eight million. I say without fear of contradiction that at least 80 p.c. of the members of the Indian Christian community would support our Conference and wish it well...As I said in my speech at the All India Christian Conference in Dec 1940, I personally would not mind *if all* the Indian members of the Viceroy's Council were Hindus or Muslims, or members of the Congress or the Muslim League, because *in nine out of ten questions, no friction or difference* can possibly arise in the Governor-General's Council.. "

Sir Jogendra Singh: "There is only one point on which I wish to dwell.. How can the Indian Army be Indian in truth, unless it is officered and equipped by Indians? The stigma of being mercenary can only be wiped off by our Army becoming truly national under the direction of an Indianised Cabinet, framing and carrying out an Indian policy and programme...The *flimsy gestures of good intentions* have failed to serve any purpose...Deeds are more convincing than words.. Govt. knows there is no hope of reconciling the irreconcilables (i.e., the Congress and the Muslim League); is it wise on its part to take advantage of the situation *which is largely of its own creation* and which does not truly reflect the heart of India?...The melancholy spectacle of some of the best and truest sons of India marching to prison under a feeling of disillusionment and distrust, mars the picture of

¹These plain criticisms of the Bureaucratic Govt., by one who served it loyally for 30 years, saw all its ins and outs, and carried out its wishes faithfully, as in duty bound while in service, are especially valuable, as being in the nature of a rank and illuminative confession.

²Sir Maharaj Singh is also in the same position as Sir Jagdish Prasad; see preceding f. n.

Brito-Indian unity...Dependence is the deadly enemy of self-confidence. Gandhi-ji has done a great deal to restore self-confidence. His is the voice of higher reason. Buddha and Christ proclaimed the same prescription for the cure of human ills, but humanity has...failed to use it. What hope is there of its use in the immediate future?...We, in the Punjab, who have been taught that pure steel is our only protection, have formed a Khalsa Defence of India League...We must remember that nations are made by themselves....We have met to put to the test, the truth and sincerity of the pledges which the Viceroy has given in the name of H. M's. Govt :.. ”

Dr. B. S. Moonje said : “...I have to bring to your notice one point which possibly has not been approached by you, and that is India's domestic problem. All these problems are the creation of the British Govt., and these problems are pressed against us...There was no *communal problem* until it was *created and manufactured by the British Govt.* as a command performance; and therefore *we should always be straightforward and frank with the Govt. and tell them that it is they who are responsible for the communal trouble...* The Govt. wants militarisation from its own point of view...with the idea of defending England...We shall do much more if we have the opportunity...We shall see that India is militarised from our point of view...”

Mr. V. D. Savarkar : “...*This Conference has struck a new note* in the political history of this country. This has proved that the various parties in India could meet—contrary to the frequently made charges—on a common platform and the basis of a programme, although they owe allegiance to different ideologies. As the President of the Hindu Maha Sabha I believe in India's right to absolute political independence. But although some of those present in this Conference are not prepared to go so far with us, I do not see why we should not travel together as long as the journey is a common one¹...The H. M. Sabha stands for complete independence; but it is prepared to join hands with any party, provided it works towards India's independence...”

¹An outstanding example, on a vast scale and of a tremendous quality, is the present ‘co-belligerency’ of Britain with Russia against Nazism, preceded by the declaration by the British Government, that though the politico-economic ‘ideologies’ of the two countries are utterly different, yet Britain will help Russia against the common enemy, Germany.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtoolah: "...As regards the second part of the resolution which deals with the declaration of Dominion Status, I would suggest, in view of the *differences of opinion* which prevail with regard to *the kind of Constitution* required for this country, that *some machinery should be devised by which we could bring about an agreed Constitution*, a Constitution which would be acceptable to all parties and interests in India, and thereby pave the way for national unity. We should cease to generalise in vague terms, and should, also, not ask H. M.'s Govt. to adjudicate..."¹

The Maharaj-adhiraj of Burdwan (deceased since) said: "It is indeed a sign of the times that we have met round this table together to raise the status of India in the eyes of the world...India is not an equal partner with the other Dominions. It is true that there are Indian troops who have done wonderfully well in Africa. But it is equally true that there has been resentment in this country that Indians were not consulted...My friend the Maharaja of Parlakimidi is here, and he and I are at one with all of you in raising the status and self-respect of our Mother India...Every Indian should be determined *not to join* any Imperial Conference or a War Cabinet, unless India can attend it as an equal partner like Canada and Australia. I think that is essential. We are not going to go there in any capacity other than as equals. Whatever we may have done in the past, we are *not* going to go there and *get a differential treatment* (again). Sir T.B. Sapru himself experienced it when he went to the Conference in 1923 and I myself in 1926..."

Sirdar Sant Singh said: "...*England claims* that she is *fighting* the present war *for the maintenance of the civilisation* of the age and *to protect the interests of humanity*. If that is so, 400 millions of people in India claim to be part and parcel of humanity, and claim that redress should be done to them. After all, what is our demand? *Our demand is to be given what is our own*—not to be given something which does not belong to us. We want India to be owned by Indians, and not in the interest of the foreigners. If England responds

¹*This is just what the present writer has been advocating for twenty years*, and is endeavouring to draw public attention to, in this book, page after page, along various lines of arguments drawn from current events.

to this demand, she is entitled to all the help we can give... How much I wish it were possible to forge some sort of *sanction* behind our resolutions which would make the Govt. of Britain see that if nothing is done to meet the wishes of even such a Conference as this, then there will be some trouble in the country...I am only suggesting for the serious consideration of our friends Sir Jagdish Prasad, our Chairman (Sir T.B. Saprú), and Sir N.N. Sircar...that if one of them, or all three, make a declaration that they will pay (? will not pay) *income tax* so long as their object is not achieved, it will be of great value..Our *proposal*, without *sanctions* behind it, will carry no weight..I want to produce a moral effect upon Britain, that there is a sanction behind the demand of this Conference..”

Sir Sultan Chinoy: “...*Indian industries* have already suffered much, and I am sure that if the present policy of the Govt. is allowed to be pursued any further, we will have to suffer more. Therefore, from the industrialist's point of view, I urge...that every effort should be made to *Indianise the present Executive Govt.* If this is done, as is suggested in the resolution, I have no doubt that all the difficulties will be overcome overnight...”

Dr. Syama Prasad Mukherji, (the text of whose speech, it is said in the Introduction to the *Proceedings*, was not available, was reported by the papers of the day, to have) said “he agreed that, so far as the *present war* was concerned, all Indians realised the need for *Britain to win it*, because a German victory would not be conducive to the cause of Indian freedom; but he *could not agree* with the view *that there was any difference between Fascism and Nazism or British Imperialism*”.

Sir T. B. Saprú, in his closing speech, said: “...The essence of the resolution is—We want a declaration, a formal declaration, that India's status, after the war, shall be the same as that of *England or any Dominion*...*Controversy* has been going on in England, and sometimes in India, as to the *meaning* of the Statute of Westminster...Our demand should be that if the Statute of Westminster will continue to survive the war and to apply to the self-governing Dominions; or if some other kind of constitutional ideas bear fruit at that time and a new adjustment of relations takes place between the constituent elements of the British Commonwealth; then our position shall not in any way be less than

that of any other constituent element...My view at that time was that the Statute of Westminster was going to queer the pitch for us in the Constitution for India which was being discussed at the R. T. Confce. I heard from the Strangers' Gallery, the debate, with regard to equality of status, in the House of Commons...When we talk of Dominion Status...we should be understood to mean not merely the enjoyment of *status*, but also of the same *powers* and *functions* as belong to Canada, Australia, and South Africa..If it is said that H. M.'s Govt. have made up their minds that India shall attain that status after the war, then I fail to discover any reason why they should not begin to *adjust the machinery to that status from now*...The real seat of power is the Centre...The real power is concentrated, not in the hands of the Home Member or the Law Member, but of the Finance Member and the Defence Member..*Defence* and *Finance* are the *key* portfolios...These two should be transferred to *Indian hands*...Our resolution may be attacked by the extreme section of politicians, that during the period of the War, this newly constructed Govt. shall be responsible to the Crown, whereas the *Congress resolution* said—I have read it half a dozen times very carefully, and I think on that point the language is *by no means clear*—that the Govt. to be established must be responsible to the Legislature. Frankly, I feel that we have taken a more moderate view, because it can be given effect to without any radical or substantial modification or amendment of the Act. If you accept my view, I feel we shall also avoid much of the communal controversy...*I differ from those who think* that we must *sever our connection with Britain*...A day will arrive when the combatants of Europe will sit at a Peace Conference. I do not wish that India should be represented at that Peace Conference, except in her own right, by representatives appointed by her National Government. The necessary implication of the resolution is that you lay the greatest stress upon *industrialisation* and rapid and adequate *militarisation* of the country. It is not the desire of any one...to steal a march on Congressmen or Muslim Leaguers. If they become, later on, ready to assume the responsibility, as persons commanding the confidence of the people, I should expect everyone who assumes the responsibility of office to-day, openly to declare that he will make room for those men, who command the confidence of (the) people, whether

they belong to the Congress or any other party. We should not like to tolerate mere careerists or office-seekers for a minute. I, therefore ask you to accept this resolution..."

The resolution was carried unanimously.

These large extracts will, it is hoped, show to the reader more fully, what the resolution also expressly says, that all the other most important political parties of India, want the *same freedom as Britain and the Dominions*; as the Congress wants; that there is *no real difference* between them as to the Objective, but only as to some words and details; though, most unfortunately, the *Moderates-Liberals are not prepared to make any sacrifice* to achieve the objective, while the Congress has been making much sacrifice. Sirdar Sant Singh's suggestion, *ré sanction*, was easily practicable, even by the Liberals; but was passed over in silence. The income tax would have been realised, by executive order, out of the bank-accounts of the protest-ants; but the fact of the active protest would have had great moral value, and been noticed in other countries.

Some Other Views re' Meaning of Independence.

The Hon'ble the Maharaj-adhiraj of Darbhanga (reputed to be the wealthiest land-holder in all India), in the course of a speech in the Central Council of State, on 6-3-1941, (*Hindustan Times*, 7-3-1941), said that "The present unrest and desperation on the part of Indian public men was due to the narrow-mindedness of these who had shaped the trend of British administration in India. 'By their lack of imagination, lack of trust and false notions about Indians, the *British administrators*, from the very beginning, *poisoned* the fountain of a relationship which could otherwise have been very sweet. It is *responsible for killing that Unity in diversity* which was the special feature of Indian life and culture. It has *magnified Diversity* and killed the spirit which made India great. We are governed today by the head, and not by the heart as we used to be...I wish to see the day when the Britishers will no longer be *distrusted or accused of breaking pledges*, when *Imperialism* will be the symbol of the system of Collective Security, and not taken to be *a system of exploitation*, when the *ultimate aim of Democracy* will not be *Dictatorship*, but real freedom and security, and when India will be in a real sense, a *free and equal partner* in the Empire of the *Commonwealth of Nations*'".

Maharaj-Kumar Sir Vijaya Anand, M. L. A., U. P. (of Vizianagram, now permanently resident in Benares ; uncle of the present minor Maharaja of Vizianagram ; ex-Minister, U. P.), in the course of a press statement d/ 17-3-1941, (*Leader and National Herald*, 19-3-1941) wrote :

"The Anglo-Indian Press in this country have already started the British hare that the Bombay resolution would mean revolutionising the Central Government and that it would be undesirable to do so during the present life-and-death struggle. Not so very long ago, elections of the biggest magnitude were held in Australia and Canada, not to speak of the United States of America, but where India is concerned it is said that during this terrible war nothing can be done.

"The Bombay Conference, which was attended by those who are foremost in India's public life, proves to be an X-ray test of the British mind. It has exposed most convincingly the *camouflage* that British spokesmen, including Mr. Amery, have indulged in for years and years. That moderate politicians and mellowed statesmen like the Right Hon'ble Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Sir N. N. Sircar, Sir Jagdish Prasad, and others, not to speak of the Maharaja-Dhiraj of Burdwan, a staunch landlord, have been so loud in their denunciation of the British Policy of speaking with two voices—(from this) the obvious inference is that there must be something utterly rotten in the 'State of Denmark'. Sir N. N. Sircar's able speech at the Conference is a lucid exposition of the British Policy of Separatism, which she has been following for her own ends. What would have been ideal for the Bombay Conference to have done is that they should have *added* in their resolution a *time-limit* for the Viceroy and Secretary of State to accept their suggestion for an Indianised Provisional Notional Government for the duration of the war, backed up by a promise to bring India on a par with other Dominions within a specified period after the war. It would have been still more ideal if they had added a provision that if within the time-limit given, the Viceroy and the Secretary of State did not respond in toto, the Conference of Moderate Opinion in this country should not be blamed if they *adopted a course* that would not be helpful to British Propaganda that India is with them lock, stock, and barrel. This alone would make the Churchill Cabinet sit up and think a bit. Otherwise, like the periodical resolutions of the Liberal Federation, this too will find its way into the dust-bin...This Committee might give

Britain a clear notice that within a stipulated time-limit she should accept the suggestions made by the Conference, failing which the Moderate elements will go their own way.

"There need be no fear that the Congress would go against the proposed scheme. The Congress stand has always been—India first. Any Government which is really national, and which wrests real power from Britain, is bound to have the country's unstinted good wishes, provided that the transfer of power is real, and—to quote Mahatma Gandhi—if it contains 'the substance of independence' and not (merely) the shadow...

"Any true and real Indian Government, even if it be responsible to the Crown is bound to recognise, first of all, the individual right of freedom of speech, which indeed is the essence of Democracy...President Roosevelt says that America is the arsenal of Democracy. One wonders if India and Indians ever come into his dreams even. If America be the arsenal, and if England be her first line of defence, it stands to reason that every British possession should be modelled in the same way..."

"The fourteenth Annual Session of the *Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry* was held at Delhi on 22-3-1941....The President, Mr. Amrit Lal Ojha, referring to the constitutional deadlock, said that it could be ended only by the establishment, at the *Centre*, of a *National Government*, pending the final settlement of the wider problems, and appealed to H. E. the Viceroy to take immediate steps to bring about a change of atmosphere"; (*Hindustan Times*, 23-3-1941).

The Muslim League's and Hindu Maha Sabha's Views re' Independence.

The views of the Hindu Maha Sabha have been sufficiently indicated above, by the quotations from the speeches of its three chief officers, Shri V. D. Savarkar, Dr. Syama Prasad Mukherji, and Dr. B. S. Moonje, and by their voting for the resolution adopted by the Non-Party Leaders' Conference.

The Muslim League and its President, Mr. Jinnah, have repeatedly used the word 'independence' to describe their objective; but this writer is not aware that they have defined what precisely they understand by it. By all indications, they too are *not* desirous of *severing* the British connection, and mean only equal status and powers with Britain and the Dominions, in short, equal *inter-dependence*. But Mr. Jinnah has emphatically declared, in public print, that if 'Self-govern-

ment' and 'Swa-raj' and 'Democracy' are to mean 'Congress-Raj', 'then he and his Muslim League will have nothing to do with it ; for Congress Raj will mean Hindu Raj, and Hindu Raj will mean the tyranny of the Hindu majority over the Muslim minority'. In this way he has succeeded in creating the existing 'block' or 'dead-lock' in the political progress of India, and played into the hands of the British Government.

At the same time, it must be noted that M. Gandhi and the High Command of the Congress have equally played into the hands of Mr. Jinnah and the M. League. (1) By the appeasement, nay propitiation, policy they have pursued towards all Muslim leaders from the beginning of the N. C. O. movement, and latterly, the M. League and its President, (2) by *behaving as if* these last were the sole representatives of the Muslims of India, and (3) *as if* the Congress was a *Hindu body*, representative of all Hindus and therefore entitled to give away generously the belongings of Hindus generally to the Muslims generally, (4) by not giving sufficient prominence to and not taking sufficient help from the Nationalist Muslims *within* the Congress, (5) by studiously ignoring, almost with contempt, the claims, representations, protests and remonstrances of the H. M. Sabha, (6) by, in consequence, violently antagonising, the H. M. Sabha and its very large and considerable following all over the country, especially in hard-headed, strong-willed, intelligent Maharashtra and intellectual, oratorical, loud-voiced Bengal, and also antagonised that very powerful, very resolute, very active and practical offshoot of reformed Hinduism, viz., the Sikh community ; by doing such things, the Congress had given a right to Mr. Jinnah and the M. League (1) to insist that the Congress is a Hindu body, (2) to claim that they are the only representatives of all the Muslims of India, (3) that Mr. Jinnah is the sole spokesman of all these Muslims, and (4) that unless all his demands are satisfied, the Indian People will not be allowed to advance a step further towards self-government. Of course, the British Govt. have very substantially helped Mr. Jinnah to take up and maintain this attitude, which serves its purposes excellently ; as clearly pointed out by Sir N. N. Sircar in the speech quoted above.

The right position and action for the Congress, as an obviously non-communal, or indeed all-communal, body, (since it includes members of all religions), was to tell the M. League and the H. M. Sabha to settle their differences

between themselves; and, if they could not, then to bring to the Congress W. C. and A. I. C. C., *precise statements* of what each wanted and of the points on which they differed; and that then the W. C. and A. I. C. C., by Special Cttee. composed of representatives of all religions, would *arbitrate* between them.

Insistence on *precise statements* would have largely brought out the absurdity, triviality, paltriness, and wrong motives, of the *wants* and the *differences*. It would have appeared plainly that there are *no* differences as to the basic human wants; that those that there are, relate to very superficial, inessential, matters, easily capable of solution by reasonable adjustment.

But it is just this *lack of precise statement* of *wants, needs, 'war-and-peace aims'*, and of a Draft of a Constitution endeavouring to harmonise and reconcile all by regulation and limitation, of which the Congress itself has been guilty, in its whole effort up to now; and, of course, also the M. League and the H. M. Sabha. This same lack is upsetting, on a vaster scale and with far more violent results, the civilisation of the 'Great Powers' of the world. It may be said that Germany has made a comparatively definite statement of Nazist aims; and Russia of Bolshevik aims; while Britain has also given, though a much less definite and much more indirect, indication of its aims by the self-contradictory words 'Democratic Imperialism'; but each of these three 'ideologies', now at war, is radically vitiated by different serious psycho-ethical vices.

This ultimate cause of all the present maladies of the Human Race, and its ultimate Remedy, have been led up to, along different lines of thought, over and over again, in the preceding pages.

In reply to the M. League's insistence that Democratic Self-Govt. in India would mean the tyranny of the Hindu majority over the Muslim minority, and that therefore the Muslims must have a separate Pakistan in which they could work Democracy comfortably; the H.M. Sabha leaders say that Hindus have *never* tyrannised over Muslims in the past, but, on the contrary have helped them to grow and multiply in members till they and some other communities (all practically *nil*, 1,200 years ago) now form 35 p. c. of the Indian population, while Hindus themselves have dwindled to only 65 p. c. (in place of the 100 p. c. that they were);

that, by Pakistan, the Muslim League wishes to revive the glories of the Aurangzeban Mughal Empire ; to make laws at will, favoring Muslims and repressing Hindus ; to establish the tyranny of the 'minority' over the 'majority' ; to place all Govt. posts and offices in the hands of Muslims, and so tyrannise at will over the Hindus left in the Pakistan areas ; to convert Hindus by force and destroy Hindu culture, as embodied in the Samskrit and Hindi languages and literatures, in temples, in modes of dress and social conventions, ways and words of salutation and greeting, etc., within the Pakistan area ; and to carry on proselytising activities within the Non-Pakistan areas also, openly or surreptitiously, and thereby demand, from time to time, further extensions of the Pakistan areas. Hindu spokesmen say that, patently, the demands of the Muslim League have steadily grown more and more voracious, ever since the virus of *separate electorates* was injected into the body-politic of India by Lord Minto, by the Act of 1909, and, most unfortunately, strengthened by the Lucknow Pact of 1916. "The more we have, the more we want", and "Appetites do grow with what they feed upon".

Muslim Leaguers promptly rejoin that *Hindu* Nationalism has revived very strongly since the sixties of the last century, when the revival was started by the Arya Samaj ; has captured the Congress ; wishes to destroy Muslim culture as enshrined in Urdu and Persian-Arabic language and literature ; and is threatening to swamp Islam in India altogether, as, in the last period of the Mughal Empire, was threatened by the Mahrattas and the Sikhs ; that if there are many conversions to Islam, it is because Hinduism is rotten.

The Hindus point out that if most of the members of the Congress are Hindus, it is the fault of the Muslims themselves ; that Muslims should have joined it in far larger numbers ; that as a fact, there *are* a considerable number of Muslims in the Congress ; that a number have been Presidents of it ; as the current year's is ; that instead of destroying, Hindus have been diligently studying and even adding to Urdu literature ; as some Muslims have been adding to Hindi literature ; that even the Sikhs and the Mahrattas *never* threatened the Islamic religion and culture, and did not try to make converts from Islam to Hinduism, but struggled only for political power ; that separatist *Muslim* Nationalism began with the Aligarh School in the sixties and seventies of the last

century. And so on and so forth.¹

The new outbreak, of mutual rivalries, jealousies, fears, hatreds, fanned into flame by the British policies of dangling crumbs of political power and service-employment before ambitious and hungry eyes, adding bitter economic competition to religious differences, and encouraging the discovery of new occasions for rioting, like 'music before mosque'; this new outbreak has led on to the cry for a separate Pakistan and is transforming the war of words into a serious menace of communal civil war in a not distant future.

Some Hindu leaders, looking at the impossibility of separating the Hindus and the Muslims of India into different areas, think and say that the Pakistan-cry is only a stunt, a manoeuvre, to fling the Hindu leaders into a noisy panic, and make the Hindus rush about uttering futile appeals to the Hindus to unite in face of imminent danger; while they, the Muslim leaders, laugh in their sleeves, and enjoy the fun, and continue to act on the principle of the Persian maxim, *Ba marg-ash bi-gīr, tā ba tap rāzi āyaḍ*, 'Threaten a person with death, and he will gladly accept a fever.' But human experience is that 'jest often turns into earnest'; and the real futility of the appeals for unity, the inability of the Hindus to unite among themselves and with the Muslims, and the increasing bitterness between the two communities, bode serious ill for the future of India.¹ But, all the same, it should be clear from what has been said and quoted above that the Objective of both H.M. Sabha and M. League is really 'the substance of Independence'.

¹The beginnings of the Aligarh Muslim, and Lahore Arya Samāj, Schools of Communal Education and Politics, are dealt with in this writer's pamphlet, *Communalism and Its Cure*.

¹The following is also taken from Mr. Jayakar's speech d/- 1-8-1941, (see f.n., p. 300, *supra*) "It seems to me that Pakistan is an astute cry, to cause panic in the ranks of the Hindus...(so that they may) agree to a further surrender of rights....But the Hindus need not give to Pakistan more serious attention than it deserves. I have no doubt it will die a natural death. Because the whole idea is absolutely unthinkable. The two-nations theory cannot last long, because there are forces working to destroy it. A large section of the Muslim community does not share the view." (Giving several reasons, mainly of cultural amalgamation, the speech continues), "I say, therefore, that this unnatural theory will die

It is to be regretted that Mr. Jayakar has thrown no light on the great questions—*Why* are the Hindus so panicky, so disunited? *How* can they be made to unite and become braver?

Signs of disintegration within the Muslim League, may be thought to be these. Muslim Premiers of the four non-Congress Provinces, Sind, Punjab, Bengal, Assam, were appointed members of his newly created Defence Council by the Viceroy. Mr. Jinnah, Pdt., M. League, ordered the last three (in Aug., 1941) to resign from it, on pain of disciplinary action being taken against them by the M. League, of which they were members. The Sind Premier, Mr. Alla Baksh, is not a member of the M. League. Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan (Punjab) and Sir Sadulla (Assam) have obeyed. Mr. Fazlul Haq (Bengal) has resigned from the Defence Council, but with a very strong protest, in the course of which he says: "As a mark of protest against the arbitrary use of powers vested in its president, I tender my resignation from the membership of

its appointed death, *unless* the Hindus bungle and give it an artificial life by their panicky efforts... Signs are already apparent that the intolerance and intransigence of the executive of the Muslim League will cause disintegration.. Pakistan is a great smoke-screen. It is intended to hide many efforts which are being made in several quarters at the present moment in India and England to fashion out some constitution which will entirely destroy the principle of majority rule. Some astute devices are being considered with the help of legal talent in India and in England, of a form of constitution, containing" (a perverted and artificial variety of manifold economic) "functional representation, irremovable executive", (half-and-half Hindu and Muslim representation), etc. One heard faint suggestions of such a contrivance in political circles in England... Another technique of Muslim leadership is to continue the present deadlock as far as it lies in their power.... The Muslim leader would hear of no changes in the constitution without the consent of the Muslim League, not even during war time..." The *Mahratta*, 12-9-1941, contains an article by the Bombay ex-Minister, Shri K. L. Munshi, which shows that Mr. Hodson, newly appointed Reforms Commissioner, just imported from England, by the Central Govt., is going about in India, canvassing in favor of just such a constitution; and also exposes its vices.

the executive committee (and council) of the M. League (also)... I cannot usefully continue to be a member of a body which shows scant courtesy to provincial leaders and which arrogates to itself the functions which ought to be exercised by the provincial executive...Recent events have forcibly brought home to me that the *principles* of democracy and autonomy in the M. League are being *subordinated* to the *arbitrary wishes* of a *single individual* who seeks to rule as an *omnipotent authority*..." "Mr. Fazlul Huq further says that he does not find any justification in resigning from (the Viceroy's) National Defence Council,...but in view of the fact that other Premiers have vacated their seats, he felt that no useful purpose would be served by his being a member of the Council;" (*National Herald* and *Statesman*, d/- 11-9-1941). The full statement appears in the *National Herald* and other dailies, of 12-9-1941, and is interspersed all over with strong language censuring Mr. Jinnah's ways. Begum Shah Newaz, Pltry. Secy. (Punjab) has also declined to obey Mr. Jinnah. So too has Sir Sultan Ahmad, appointed Law Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council. These two have been formally expelled from the Muslim League. Thus, then, Mr. Jinnah, who has been now and then charging M. Gandhi with acting as a 'dictator', is now being called a 'super-dictator', desirous of exercising 'omnipotence', by one of the most prominent members of the M. League.

Two British Views.

Before passing on to Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru's views, we may reproduce, and comment upon, two British opinions, by writers of note.

"Fresh light on the problems of India is thrown in an important book published by Sir George Schuster and Mr. Guy Wint, viz., *India and Democracy*. Mr. Wint devoted *two years* to studying the subject *on the spot* (i.e., in India)... The main thesis of Sir G. Schuster is that the Indian problem should be approached, *not* from the point of view of *political manoeuvring*, but from the point of consideration of what are the *real tasks* of an Indian National Government in order to ensure the *Welfare of the People of India* themselves. He emphasises that much of *what is necessary can only be done* by an *Indian National Govt.* rather than an official one, and he therefore desires to see an Ind. Nat. Govt. *established as quickly as possible*. He believes that *if once India's political parties would tackle the real job of constructive*

work for the welfare of the people, many of the present problems might find solutions in the actual process of working them out. Mr. Gwynn writes in the *Manchester Guardian* that the book is the best and most important contribution to the solution of the Indian problem that has appeared for many a long day;" (abridged from Reuter, 17-9-1941, *Hindustan Times*, 18-9-1941).

Sir George Schuster, it should be noted, was Finance Member of the Central Government of India for the five years preceding 1935, and may be credited with full and intimate knowledge of Indian affairs.

Now, compare with the above extract, the following.

The *Hindustan Times*, 21-9-1941, reproduced Reuter, (London, 19-9-1941) re the (London) *Times*' 'Advice to Indian Politicians'. The *Times* speaks of "the German Armies' thrust to the Caucasus", describes the danger to India "with a storm gathering on both sides of her", and regrets that "the manifest unity of the country still fails to transcend the political schism....The Congress still stands rigidly for the dogma of majority rights, which seems to its opponents to have no possible consummation but the establishment of a party State," (i.e. Congress Party State or 'Congress-Raj'). "The Muslim League have now officially espoused Mr. Jinnah's project of Pakistan, which means a Partition of India, and setting up of small sovereignties such as have lately shown themselves in Europe lamentably ill-fitted to survive in the ruthless international climate of today. The resignation, under Mr. Jinnah's order, of three League Ministers, who had joined the New National Defence Council has just given another regrettable example of the tendency to give a narrower cause precedence over broader." It says, further on, "that the dead-lock between rival schools of philosophy may have a chance of revolution (? re-solution) if it is brought out into larger air and view(ed) in more ample light". Later comes the usual circumlocutory platitude and evasion, "There is a general desire in England to see India free and self-governing, though it is coupled with the sense that it remains the duty of the British Government to ensure that the new self-governing institutions shall be based on justice to all Indians." Finally come these really true and important sentences (abridged): "*India, as generally agreed, cannot stand alone. The lesson taught by the present war is that no nation can stand alone...What we have to build up as the foundation of a New World Economy*

is the doctrine of duties of nations in *Co-operative Interdependence*... Under all the present controversies, India shares the ideal of *Common Brotherhood* on which the *British Commonwealth* is founded; and by maintaining her place—which she can hold *on her own terms*—as a *link* between the Commonwealth and the Asiatic Civilisation, she will perform a service that *no* other nation can offer to the world."

All very fine. *But*—has the Times ever before, or even now, thought of advising, not only the Indian politicians, but the British Government, *to do* something to *prove* its honesty and sincerity. The (Wardha) Congress Working Committee's statement, 14-9-1939, (see p. 23 *supra*) does nothing more than ask for such proof. This whole book is one long and detailed presentation of just the ideas contained in the last sentence of the above extract, with the very important correction that India must not merely be suffered complacently "to share the ideals of the common brotherhood on which the British Commonwealth is founded", or to remain merely a "*link*" between it and Asia, but should become active equal partner in an Indo-British Commonwealth; and more, it makes a very 'practical' suggestion for immediate action by the British Government in a way which will satisfy even the Times' virtuous sense of duty to do "justice to all Indians", and will meet all other requirements as well, (vide pp. 247-248, *supra*). But all such proof is being carefully evaded, and we have only high-sounding, sanctimonious, and slippery phrases instead. "Which she can hold *on her own terms*" is particularly edifying, when Indians have been put in prison by tens of thousands, merely for declaring conscientious objection to imperialist war.

The *Times* talks of India's failure "to transcend the political schism". No doubt a great failure; but does not the *Times* know of "the manifest unity" that there is between all parties in India as to the *immediate cause* of that failure, viz., British policy? This has been very amply dealt with in this book, in connection with the Hindu-Muslim problem; (see also pp. 296-317, *supra*). The blind bigotry and selfishness of the religio-political leaders is, of course, the root-cause.

It seems to deprecate "the dogma of majority rights." Has it recommended the adoption of any other more suitable one, for the 'Democracy' of its *own* country? Can it, will it, suggest any other, as better for India?

It deprecates "small sovereignties"; but does not

plainly, honestly, say what it would like to see on the earth, instead. Very probably, if 'its heart' could be seen, there would be found written on it—"One vast British Sovereignty"; and perhaps, also, "another vast U. A. American Sovereignty"; certainly not German, not Russian, not Italian or French or Japanese or Chinese or any other

The *Times* talks of "the storm gathering on both sides of India" now, when Britain is herself in the very midst of a terrible storm and in great danger. Did it ever advise Britain to train India for self-defence and for irresistible help to Britain, when 'the atmosphere was favorable', in all these past many decades, during which the public workers of India have been crying themselves hoarse, all in vain, asking Britain to thus train India, or even allow India to train herself?

It says "The Indian politician's distrust of British motives precludes" (not the solution but) "any *rational approach* to solution of the constitutional problem." Has it ever tried to discover what the *cause* is, of this distrust. Has it ever suggested to the British Government to endeavour to find out that cause? Has it ever counselled that Government to do something which would *create trust*, in place of the distrust? Will bludgeoning, shooting, imprisoning, fining, confiscating, and such other methods of repression, create trust? Are not such things more or less like the doings of the Nazis to Jews and dissentient Germans, for which the *Times* and other papers and all the politicians of Britain have been rightly inveighing against the Nazis? Can it conscientiously say that Indian politicians have *no* valid grounds for such distrust? Can it conscientiously say that the British Government has ever shown any real trust in the Indian People? Does it not know that trust breeds trust, and suspicion breeds suspicion; and that it is the duty of the more powerful to make the advance in such matters?

It talks with wise air of a "New World Economy" and "Nations in Co-operative Inter-dependence." Has it ever propounded, is it even now thinking at all of propounding, any tangible, discussable, Scheme of such New World Economy and Co-operative Interdependence? Many honest M.P.'s and Labor leaders not in office in Britain, have been urging such formulation and discussion for some years; in vain, so far as the Government is concerned.

It talks of "the dead-lock between rival schools of political philosophy", and of the "chance of its solution, if viewed in

ampler light." Are not 'Democratic Imperialism', 'Fascism-Nazism', 'Communism-Bolshevism', only "rival schools of political philosophy" (and 'political' now means 'politico-economical'); and is there not a (not dead-lock) but *deadly-interlocking*, between these, in Europe, today; and will not the solution of this deadly-grapple be brought about only if the "ampler light" of a rational "New World Economy" is thrown upon it? And have not Mr. Churchill and the Ministers appointed by him, and their followers, and the *Times*, been studiously avoiding all such "ampler light"?

Britain, Germany, Russia, each of these three has been openly hating the other two, all along, and been wanting, at heart, that the other two may destroy each other, and that it alone may be left in sole possession of One Vast Sovereignty over Europe, Asia, and Africa, at least, to begin with; Japan and China would be easily intimidated and brought to heel, later; and the New World could be attended to at leisure. U.S.A. is no doubt sincerely desirous that Britain should win; but she is also plainly desirous that she, U.S.A., should not have to pay for that victory; 'once burnt, twice shy'; she has had enough experience of the consequences of 'putting foot into it', in the last war.

"There is a *general desire* in England to see India free and self-governing", but *no particular haste* to do so, on the part of the British Government!; only, 'at the earliest *possible moment*', 'as soon as there is a *favorable opportunity* and *favorable atmosphere*', 'after the War'—some hundreds of years hence, it may be!

No, Mr. Editor of the London *Times*!, pompous platitudes, circumlocutory phrases, diplomatic language, and worn-out excuses won't do! "Physician, cure thy-self"! "Honesty is, and will in the end prove to be, the best policy". You deprecate 'small sovereignties'; but who created these in Europe, after the Great War? Was it not the 'power-balancing' Mr. Lloyd George and his colleagues at Versailles? Have you ever advised the British Government *not* to *encourage* fissiparous provincialism in India and multiplication of small provinces, which will prove much worse than 'small sovereignties'? Have you ever said that an all-co-ordinating, super-ordinate, Federal World-State is the only solution, now, of all such difficulties?

The same issue of the *Hindustan Times* reports that Dr. Henry Grady, Pt. Roosevelt's special economic Investigator

in the Far East and representative of the Federal Loan Agency, was in Calcutta on 18-9-1941, to confer "with officials here re supply of strategic materials needed in the *defence* programme of the U.S.A., British Empire, Latin countries, Dutch Indies, and Phillippines". He said, to a press representative, "We are *beginning* to make provisions for war supplies to Russia, because she (also) is now...struggling to *destroy aggression* in the world...Explaining further his mission in the Phillipines, Dutch Indies, British Malaya, India, and Southern China, he said his purpose was to ascertain what could be done to stimulate the flow of strategic *material* for their *war industries* and to make certain that none of these materials were going to the Axis Powers. This section of the world was one of the *richest in minerals and vegetable products* that existed in the world. That was why, Dr. Grady pointed out, this section had been included in the expansion programme—*euphionously* called the *New Order*—of the Axis countries. This part of the world must make its contribution to *defences*...."

The same issue reproduces an article by M. Litvinov, former Russian Foreign Minister, contributed to the British paper, *Reynolds' News*, in which he *complains* that Britain and America are *not* giving *sufficient* assistance to Russia. Subsequent issues, during the third week of Sep. 1941, say that Cabinet Minister Montague has replied that 'Britain's responsibilities extend from Spitzbergen to Tobruk', i.e., are not limited to helping Russia; and Mr. Maisky, Russia's ambassador in London has re-joined that Russia is fighting not for herself but for the safety and freedom of all the world; which is just what Britain and Germany also have been saying. These issues also say that skirmishes and collisions between Japanese and Russian forces have begun on the Russo-Japanese frontier; that war between the two is imminent; and that Japan is on the point of invading Thailand and possibly Burma also. Mr. Montague forgot to mention Britain's 'responsibilities' in Indo-Burma, Palestine, Syria, Iraq, Iran, and Egypt.

The impartial reader can easily judge for himself, on which side the "euphionousness" called "the New Order", or the "New World Economy", lies; how far U.S.A.'s own 'New Deal' is 'euphionous', how far not; whether the *aggression* which should be destroyed, is by Germany and Italy only, or by Britain and America and Russia too; whether it is right to utilise the "rich mineral and vegetable products" of India and the other eastern countries, for only the purposes of the

war, ('euphoniously' called 'defence'), of Britain and U.S.A., or for the promotion of the general welfare of those eastern countries also; whether Russia's complaints are justifiable; and whether there were not many complaints in Britain itself, up to a few months ago, that U.S.A. assistance to Britain was not being given sufficiently. M. Litvinov's and M. Maisky's complaints seem, however, to have speeded up the assistance, which, moreover, must have been greatly facilitated by the 'opening up' of Iran. Germany used to complain similarly, down to May, 1941, of the tardiness and inadequacy of help from Russia; and decided to invade Russia, and seize by force; the two Powers had been *apparently* friendly, till then; but only as against the then common foe, Britain; in reality each was 'biding its time'. Russia, too, had flatly rejected the overtures of Britain, for alliance against Germany, in the early days of the War, and had plainly said that 'she could not allow herself to be made a catspaw of Britain, as many other Powers had done'; but there is *some virtuous quality* still left somewhere in the British People, which induces Providence to tilt the balance in their favor, from time to time; therefore, while the complaints of Germany against Russia have resulted in fierce war between the two, those of Russia against Britain and U.S.A. have resulted in the increasing and speeding up of help against the now common foe. But until that virtuous quality is shown to India also, there will be no peace for Britain.

The advice of the *Times* to Indian politicians is mere temporising 'diplomacy', and not very clever diplomacy at that. It cannot take in anybody now. An *honest* "New World Economy", an *honest* "New Order", is the only Remedy for the World's Maladies; not diplomatic fencings, and offencings, and defencings. When the whole body is covered with sores due to blood-poisoning, it is no use trying to put little bits of plaster on each of the sores. Only a powerful *Alterative* and *Blood-purifier* can effect the needed Cure, by *altering* radically, re-novating, re-vitalising, the whole constitution of the body-politic of the whole Human Race.

We may now consider the views of Pt. J. Nehru.

The Views of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru re' Independence and re' World-Order.

As regards 'Independence', it is enough to say that, in his Congress Presidential addresses, (Lahore, 1929, and Lucknow,

1936), and on other public occasions, he has clearly recognised and said that '*In-dependence*' is a wrong word, and that equal '*Inter-dependence*' is the right word; but he has not endeavoured, or has not been able, to press it to acceptance by the Congress. He is too well acquainted with, and too observant of, current history, to imagine that any country can be really completely '*in-dependent*' of other countries, today, and stand by itself in solitary self-completeness and self-complacence. Scientific discoveries and inventions and political and commercial enterprise have bound all together inseparably. Pt. Jawaharlal has frequently tried to draw the attention of the Congress and of the general Indian public to the fact that India is only a part of the world, and that Indian politicians should *not* think, now, that Indian affairs can be improved in isolation from general world-advance and a '*New World Order*'. We have seen before how he has managed to introduce the phrase into the famous Wardha Stt. of 14-9-1939, (pp. 22-24, *supra*). This writer has reason to think that his colleagues of the High Command merely tolerated the sentences containing it, as a concession to Pt. Jawaharlal's feelings; because he has heard leading Congressmen good-humouredly ridiculing his 'hobby' of introducing idealistic '*World Order*' out of season, instead of confining himself to India's affairs with the proper '*practicality*'. His '*practical*' colleagues do not realise that though we need not keep looking at the stars (or the nautical compass, which means reference to the North Pole) constantly, yet it is necessary to look at them, from time to time, if we are to take our little ship in the right direction. Without '*high Ideals*', our '*Reals*' become ever more and more gross and coarse, and descend ever lower and lower. '*Hitch your wagon to the stars*', as a western writer has counselled wisely, and guide your course by them, though your wagon must necessarily travel on the earth.

We shall therefore now discuss Pt. Nehru's views as regards World Order, the principal theme of this book; a British-Indian or Indo-British Commonwealth being its second main theme, and, in a sense, even more important, as the foundation of the other, and also as much more easily realisable, because it needs '*change of heart*' in only two peoples, British and Indian.

The quotations made in the earlier parts of this book show how thoughtful minds are working in the West. From this West, almost all Indian '*leaders*' take most of their

ideas; though some condemn and even endeavour to avoid 'slave-mentality'. This is only natural in the circumstances of the country. Many positive schemes also, of a 'New World-Order', have been put forward by individual writers, in the past few years, in Britain as well as the U. S. A.; but by none, (so far as this writer is aware), so persistently, so unremittingly, so passionately, for so many years, with such endeavour to induce general discussion and elicit co-operation, as by Mr. H. G. Wells. Of course, the dictators of Russia, Italy, Germany, are working their own (nationalist Bolshevik, Fascist, Nazi) varieties of 'World-Order', within their territories. But it is fairly obvious that there is something seriously 'dis-order-ly' in all these 'orders', (even as in the Démocratist variety of 'World-Order'); since (from such accounts as are available in India) the peoples of those countries are not at peace, internally, among the various sections; and, externally, are at war, with other peoples. The reason is that, in their mouths and minds, 'World-Order' means 'World-Dominion' or rather 'World-Domination'. General Bernhardt of Germany, published a book entitled "World-Dominion or Downfall", shortly before the previous Great War of 1914-'18. The Russian Dictator may perhaps claim that he does not crave for World-Domination, but has always desired only that the Russians might be left in peace, by the other Powers, to work out their salvation in their own way. The other 'Powers', on the other hand, not inaptly reply, that the Russians have been not only carrying on above-board dissemination of their communist-socialist views by publicly available printed literature, but have also been employing secret underhand methods of a dangerous character, to bring about *violent revolutions*, in other countries, in favour of their own variety of World Order; in fact, 'World-Revolution' has been one of the slogans of the Communists.

In India, no eminent or prominent person, who looms large in the public eye, speaks, and, presumably, thinks, seriously, about a New World Order—with one single exception.¹

¹The *Leader*, 2-10-1941, reports the following, as part of a Message addressed to the People of the Indian States, by Mahatma Gandhi, on 1-10-1941:—

"I am convinced that in the *New World Order* which is bound to follow the insensate butchery dignified by the name of war, the princes will have place only if they become true

That exception is Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru—recklessly courageous, chivalrous, very self-sacrificing, very highly educated, in English literature, science, law, very well-read, very widely travelled, even to Moscow, and with personal experience of life in Chinese Chungking as well as Spanish Barcelona, while they were being actually bombed by the enemy. He is now known to all the world, as being the most popular political leader in India, next after Mahatma Gandhi, though

servants of the people....I advise the People of the States to cultivate patience...This does not mean submission to active and acute tyranny of which I have so many accounts coming to me. This, the victims *must resist in the best manner they can. The only best manner I know is the way of non-violence*, otherwise called conscious and deliberate self-suffering. But cases of individual torture and degradation have come under my notice. If they are true, and *if the tortured persons do not know the way of non-violence, they will resist the tortures with all the violence they can summon from within and die in the attempt to resist the torture and the degradation. That violent resistance will almost count as non-violence*, even as the resistance of a mouse to a ferocious cat will count." So far as this writer is aware, this is the first time that Mahatma Gandhi has expressed conviction that a New World Order is coming ; with the implication that it is *needed*. This is exceedingly hopeful. He should also give the world his suggestions, sure to be of great value and weight, as to *what the fundamentals of that Order should be* ; bearing in mind that 'Order', here, means a 'comprehensive system'. The last two sentences also throw light on his views on the question of Violence *versus* Non-Violence, touched on before, from time to time. If there be any truth in the Indian spirituo-philosophical traditions, then a 'mouse' which dies, fighting valiantly, in the exercise of its legal right of private self-defence, against a marauding criminal 'cat', will be 'reborn' as a powerful and faithful 'sheep-dog', from which not only 'cats' but also 'wolves' will flee at sight. Shri M. S. Aney (see f.n. p. 298, *supra*), appointed member of the Viceroy's expanded Council, in Sep. 1941, has also now caught up the idea of a 'New Order'. To a gathering of students at Jubbulpore, on 2. 10. 1941, he said: "India...has to play an important part in the *New Order* which will be ushered in *after* the War". Of what sort—he may well begin thinking out now.

of very different temperament. He has large aspirations, he has vision, he does not believe in "one step enough for me". In almost all his speeches and writings, latterly, he has been connecting India with world conditions and a 'New World Order', which he hopes and longs for ardently. But, most unfortunately, his visions are hazy clouds, mere wishes and aspirations. In his Congress presidential addresses, above referred to, he has said that "the Russian variety of Socialism is not suitable for India", that "India must think out her own most suitable sort of Socialism". But he has never put before the public, or even the A. I. C. C., his own ideas of the sort of Socialism that would be suitable for this unhappy country, for consideration, discussion, modification, improvement.

Shortly before going to jail in October, 1940, (with vacillation natural when the subject has not been carefully thought out), he said, in a newspaper article, that Russian socialism would fit India also. He probably meant, 'with some very important modifications'. Once, early in 1934, he placed before the Provincial Congress Committee (of the U.P. of Agra and Oudh) the excellent proposal, that the Congress should make up its mind as to what sort of 'economic structure' it desired for India. The proposal was, it seems, politely 'postponed for future consideration'. Then too, shortly after, he walked into jail. He has been imprisoned some seven times, so far.

The *Hindustan Times*, 21-10-1940, published an article by him (written before he walked into prison), headed "Our Social Welfare; Problem to be attacked on all fronts". That article deserves to be reproduced in every journal in this country. It embodies Pt. Jawaharlal's first glimpse (so far as this writer is aware), of the 'vision of what is needed'. A very brief abstract follows, using his own words, intercalating others in brackets.

"*Social welfare*, the well-being of society, includes everything one can think of—*spiritual, cultural, political, economic, and social*. The social worker considers himself as working in a field strictly separated from political action or economic theory. He will fight disease, or slum conditions, or unemployment, or prostitution, and the like. He may also seek to bring about some changes in the law, to remedy (some particular) present-day injustice. He will seldom go down to the roots of the problem; for he accepts the general structure of society as it is, and seeks only to tone down

(this or that particular) glaring injustice. Yet all this good work is *largely wasted*, because it deals with the *surface* of the problem *only*. Social evils have *roots* in the *economic structure* under which we live, are indeed the direct products of that economic system. Any *scientific consideration* of the problem of social welfare must, therefore, inevitably go down to these *roots* and seek out the *causes*. For nearly two years, now, I have been associated with the National Planning Committee, and the conviction has grown upon me", (rather late, seeing that he has been thinking and speaking about a *New World Order* for so many years), "*that it is not possible to solve any major problem by itself. They all hang together, and they depend greatly on the Economic Structure. Before we seek any particular reform, we must be clear what our general Objective is, and what kind of Society we are aiming at. It is obvious that if we have a Social Structure which assures (1 and 2) work and security to all adults, (3) proper education for the young, (4) a widespread distribution of the necessities and amenities of life and (5) a measure of individual freedom for self-development; this, in itself, will solve many of our social problems. The problem has, therefore, to be attacked on all fronts. Possibly the greatest difficulty will be along the so-called (6) religious front. Inheritance, marriage, divorce, are all supposed to be parts of the 'personal law' of various communities, and this 'personal law' is supposed to be part of religion. It is the duty of the Government of the day, to educate public opinion to accept the changes proposed.*"

To this excellent statement, we may add, 'Pending the growth of the sense of that great duty in the Government of the day, *it is the urgent duty of the leaders of the Congress at least, to first make their own minds clear as to what changes are desirable, and, then, to educate public opinion extensively and intensively. We have also to realise that while social evils are born from a vicious and inequitable economic structure, such structure itself has roots in the uncontrolled greeds, lusts, ambitions, selfishnesses, of strong individuals and groups. To break the vicious circle thus created, both (a) an Equitable Social Organisation and (b) a Universal Religion (which will not attempt to supersede or abolish any particular religion, but will reconcile all, by emphasising the *Essentials* common to all), are needed, whereby the natural egoistic as well as altruistic human*

instincts and passions will be given controlled and reasonable play.¹

¹An Indian friend, recently returned from South America, who has travelled all over the world, and spent many years in Europe (including Britain but not Russia) and both the Americas, told this writer (in Jan., 1941) that the western mind prefers to attack problems separately in detail, likes to begin with particular evils, (like Pt. Jawaharlal's 'Indian social reformer' who imitates the western), and shies at comprehensive 'ideal' plans; in short, believes in specialism and expertism. But that is just the cause why such vast mischief as these World Wars, has not been found possible to prevent. The more thoughtful leading men in even the west, are beginning to realise this, now, in various ways. A year or two ago, the dailies reported that Lord Horder (physician to King George VI) had expressed the view, that specialisation was going to dangerous excess in medical practice, and that the general medical practitioner was much more needed than the specialist expert. If the general health is good, then specialists' operations are less needed, in the first place; and, when needed, are more successful; otherwise, 'the operation is completely successful, but the patient dies of the shock.' The word 'Planning,' (in imitation of Russia), which has come into currency everywhere, indicates the same tendency towards comprehensiveness, without which, the indispensable *co-ordination* and *reconciliation* of the various conflicting lines of action suggested by different specialists, as regards different departments of the collective social life, "spiritual, cultural, political, economic," are impossible; for 'doctors disagree'; and 'expert doctors' more than 'general doctors'; and in a double way, f.i., two eye-specialists will disagree more acutely than two general practitioners; and what the eye-specialist prescribes for the eye will probably cause trouble to the ear; and what the ear-specialist prescribes for the ear, trouble to the eye, and both will upset the nervous and the digestive systems.

Hence, as Jawaharlal has realised, and says rightly, "the problem has to be attacked on all fronts," *simultaneously*. But what he has probably not realised yet, any more than western writers on these matters seem to have done, is that all fronts can be attacked simultaneously only with the help of the *facts and laws of psychology*, and of *physiology*, which deal with the *nature* of the human being, *out of which nature all these problems*

The realisation and the strenuous fulfilment of this need to 'attack the Problem on all fronts simultaneously', which Pandit Jawaharlal has now realised and expressed at last, is an exceedingly valuable and utterly indispensable *supplement and complement* to the moral exhortations and struggle-methods of Mahatma Gandhi. *Very valuable and indispensable* as those moral appeals and devices are, they are all sterilised and brought to sad failure again and

arise. Some persons speak, now and then, of individuals groups, nations, undergoing a '*change of psychology*'; they mean only a '*change of character*', from prevaillingly egoistic to prevaillingly altruistic, or vice versa; from predominantly militarist to predominantly mammonist, or the other way; from peace-minded to war-minded, or the contrary. The words '*change of heart*,' mean the same thing. *All* these instincts, characters, types, and changes, are *included* in and covered by *Psychology* as a Science. All the '*fronts*' together, are '*within*' the human being primarily; and only secondarily, '*without*' him. We have to look from both points, from '*within*' and also from '*without*'; but primarily from the '*within*', which governs the '*without*'. Science is for life; not life for science. Matter is for mind; not mind for matter. The human mind, in its old Indian phase of development, learnt to look at the things of the flesh with the eye of the Spirit; in its modern western phase of evolution, it has been looking at the things of matter, with the eye of Matter, too much, latterly, and has been ignoring the Spirit almost wholly. *Both* points of view have to be *combined*, if human life is to be given its due balance, poise, peace, prosperity. The west is producing books on the Psychology of Industry, of (legal) Evidence, of Sex, of Leadership, of Crowds, of Religion, of Aesthetics, of Politics, of Education, of Laughter, etc. More than all this is needed the Philosophy and Psychology of Social Organisation; i.e., an understanding of the principles, the laws and facts, of Human Life and Human Nature, a grasp of the meaning, purpose, ends, of Life, and how to live it so as to make it rational and fairly happy. On such knowledge only can, and should, a successful Organisation of Society be based, and all the problems of individual as well as collective human life, be attacked and solved at once. The old Indian Socio-Individualism claims to do this. See Appendix C.

again, just for lack of this *absolutely necessary additional* work. To borrow some words from a good editorial of the *Statesman*, d/ 26-11-1940, "...To preach non-violence is to waste time on a useless effort to change *symptoms* of a disease instead of dealing with its *cause*. *Greed, ...ambition* to get very rich, and to acquire *power* over other men's lives and labor...are the *cause* of war. It is violence from the air that will cure the civilian of his greed. For the first time in history, the civilian is well in the *war* that *his economics have made*. For the first time he will end by willingness to *change his economics*". After the word 'non-violence', some words need to be added, viz., 'without qualifications, and without much other positive teaching ré right 'economic structure', the *manner* in which 'economics should be changed'; (see pp. 105-107, *supra*).

Mahatma Gandhi's ways and Pandit Jawaharlal's views; How they can be reconciled.

Mahatma Gandhi on the one side, and Pt. Jawaharlal and the Working Committee (including Shri Rajagopalachari) i. e., the whole of the Congress, on the other, parted company expressly, for a short while; each was in-effective, neither could get on, without the other; so they reunited; *in action; not really in views*; (see pp. 275-276, *supra*). The result of this very partial unity is and will be, that the action is not and will not be so strong and effective as it should be, and otherwise would be. Yet there is *no* fundamental incompatibility between the views of the two. They can be easily reconciled, if each would only shed a little of his extremism. 'Intuition' and 'intellect', high morals and far-seeing broad-planning reason, indispensably need each other. They are as heart and head. Each is incomplete without the other. 'Prayer and inspiration' are as the breathing of air; 'carefully thinking and reasoning out results and planning out long-sighted programmes' are as liquid and solid food.

If Mahatma Gandhi would not confine himself to the Sermon on the Mount, and to the sentiments of Tolstoi, Emerson, and Thoreau (some of whose finest thoughts are only a reflection, and fresh and fine expansion, of the incomplete glimpses they have caught of the ancient Indian thought)¹ ;

¹"The doctrine of Jesus is to me only one of the beautiful doctrines which we have received from the ancient civilisations of Egypt, Israel, Hindustan, China, Greece. The two

if Pt. Jawaharlal would not focus attention on only the writings of Marx and Engels and Lenin¹; if they would both *jointly study the full significance* of even only *two lines* of the world-honored *Gita*, which Mahatma Gandhi believes in, as much as in the Sermon on the Mount; viz., the *two lines which lay down the principles of Social Organisation*; if, together with Maulana Azad, they would study in the light of these two lines, a single sentence of the (Swa-dēshi) famous *Āin-i-Akbarī* of Abul-Fazl; if they would do so, they would find their views completely reconciled. They would, then, all be able to co-operate much more whole-heartedly, effectively, strongly. (It will be remembered that Maulana Azad, present President of the Congress, just before going to jail in Jan. 1941,

great principles of Jesus, (a) the love of God, i. e., of absolute perfection, and (b) the love of one's neighbour, i. e., of all men without distinction, have been preached by all the sages of the world"; Tolstoi's *Letter to Jan Styka*, quoted in Radhakrishnan's *Eastern Religions and Western Thought*, p. 248. "In America, Thoreau, Emerson, and Walt Whitman show the influence of Indian thought. Thoreau says: "The pure Walden water is mingled with the sacred water of the Ganges". Emerson's Oversoul is the Param-ātmā of the Upanishads"; Ibid., p. 249.

¹It is no wonder that Russia is the cynosure of very many eyes today. The condition of the masses there, is reported by impartial Britons, with first-hand knowledge, to be far better than it was under the Czars. But there are certain great evils also, due to neglect of some fundamental facts and laws of human psychology. Similarly it is no wonder that the Indian 'caste system' inspires only contempt and disgust in very many thoughtful minds. Its corruptions and evils are so patent. These too are due to the neglect of the same fundamental psychological principles, in another way. If those principles were duly recognised and operated by the two systems, they would appear to be almost identical, perhaps. And they *can* be, and *ought* to be, operated. It is only needed to create the needed healthy mental atmosphere, of 'Scientific-Social-Organisation-Mindedness' by wide-spread *education* of Public Opinion; even as the noxious atmosphere of arrogant and greedy 'nationalism', or of 'War-mindedness', or 'Science-mindedness', or 'Air-mindedness', etc., has been created in the west, from time to time.

expressed clearly his complete dissent from the doctrine of unqualified Non-Violence, in respect of the defence of India from armed aggression). With their exceptional will-power, driving-force, heroic self-sacrifice, capacity for attracting and securing the devotion of the people *en masse*, they would be able to lead that People, without vacillations, steadily and successfully, to the clearly-visualised, widely-understood, steadfastly, loyally, and unitedly striven-for goal. Excess is the one sin of all sins ; extremism is the one error of all errors, the one delusionism of all isms.¹ Let the leaders of thought

¹For instance, many years ago, Mahatma Gandhi described his ideal Swaraj in a booklet entitled *Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule* ; briefly, no machinery, no railways, no post, telegraph, press, no military, police, law courts, no towns, no elaborate arts, no doctors, no medicines, no hospitals of course ; only villages and agricultural life, simple nature-cures for diseases and accidents ; no artificial lighting, people to sleep and rise with the sun, travel only as far as their legs could carry them. To the best of this writer's recollection, the booklet did not say how wild carnivores, tigers, wolves, etc., or herds of wild herbivores, boars and swine, deer, destructive of crops, were to be dealt with ; or robbers and dacoits or armed foreign invaders. The booklet fell utterly flat ; people naturally thought, 'Why not go back still further to the condition of cave-man, or arboreal man, or to the anthropoid stage, or the vegetable or mineral stage, or *pralaya* itself ?' Mahatma Gandhi still believes in that 'Hind Swaraj.' In a message, d/- 14-7-1938, to *The Aryan Path* (a Bombay monthly), he said : "After the stormy thirty years through which I have since passed," (i.e., since the first Gujarati edition was published), "I have seen nothing to make me alter the views expounded in it." This message prefaces a very fine and most interesting collection of 'opinions' on the book, extending over three numbers, written by well-known British, American, and Indian writers. Most of them eulogise the high moral and spiritual intention of the book ; most of them also disapprove of its *extremism*, and consider it *retrograde* and *useless* as a *practical guide* in individual and collective life, in the present stage of human evolution and civilisation ; and they rightly advocate only *regulation*.

Yet Gandhi-ji has, now and again, also said, in print, that some *controlled machinery*, should be allowed, especially such.

and action only remember, and teach to their followers, these simple and very old time-tested truths; and much dispute, much conflict, much misery, would be avoided by mankind.

Because of the lack of unity, between these two leaders, older and younger, on the vital, all-important subject of the

as can be worked by hand, (and perhaps by foot also). Sewing machines are a special favorite of his; perhaps he would allow bicycles too. But how are these to be manufactured, without much other machinery? Shri Rajagopalachari, generally believed to be his nearest, dearest, and most confidential friend, who understands him best and most, after having had to do the work of Prime Minister of Madras for a couple of years, (and the Madras Ministry was the most successful and least blamed of all the seven Congress Ministries), told Mahatma Gandhi roundly, in July 1940, (as reported in *The Hindustan Times*), in effect, that the administration of a country was not an affair for spiritual experiments, like a sanyāsi's *matha* (monastery). As to non-violence, Mahatma Gandhi's ordering of the poisoning of a very sick calf, to end its pain, years ago, at Sabarmati; his verdict, that it was right to destroy the dangerous superfluity of dogs which had become too numerous in the Ahmedabad municipality; his indication, that hordes of destructive monkeys might be similarly dealt with; his formal permission, formally asked for and given, to slaughter a mad jackal which once invaded Sevagram, (the village in which he now lives in the C.P.); are standing jokes, to the 'tough-minded' members of his own intimate staff; and cause of tremendous cogitation and head-and-heart-searching to the 'tender-minded.' He has also said, in print, at times, that a certain amount of military and police is permissible, for maintaining internal peace; and yet again, when the Congress had taken up Ministry in seven provinces, he pronounced the opinion that these Ministries should be able to do without military and police. All such vacillations are due to two causes; (a) Mahatma Gandhi's very natural *revulsion* from the *horrible* consequences of the *excesses* of modern western civilisation, which revulsion is so excessive as to have carried him beyond the right 'middle course'; and (b) his not having had the time and opportunity to duly consider what the old books teach, as regards the rights-and-duties of the Pravṛtti-mārga, the Pursuant first half of human life, with its two stages, of 'student' and 'house-holder', and the rights-and-duties of the Nivṛtti-mārga, the Renunciant second half of

Nature of the Goal; which lack of unity is due to great haziness in the minds of both, on that subject; and to extremism, on various other matters; the Congress cannot make steady progress. Instead, Mahatma Gandhi's successive very

life, with its two stages, of 'honorary, unremunerated, public worker' and 'hermit' wholly devoted to spiritual exercises. Because of this insufficient grasp of the Ancient Individual-Socialist Scheme and Code of Life, he vaguely, vacillatingly, thinks and suggests that the whole of individual human life should be governed by the rules which are appropriate to only the fourth and last quarter of it. If he were to say (as he is in effect, saying now) that, for the *political struggle* which he is carrying on, only such persons should come forward as are prepared to observe the rules appropriate for the third and fourth quarters of life, then his position would be perfectly sound and logical and in entire accord with the Swa-deshi traditions. This point has been dealt with before also (pp. 286-296). It has been said, now and then, that 'if you begin with Defensive Violence, you will end with offensive'. But we might as well give up eating, because 'if we begin with healthy feeding, we will end with unhealthy gourmandising.' *Excess must be guarded against.* Perpetual vigilance is the price of freedom from physical, mental, moral disease, as well as from political bondage. It is, no doubt, the profoundest Vedanta-Truth, that 'If the Infinite Soul once begins to attach and identify itself to and with an infinitesimal body, it will end (first) with all sorts of *at-tach-ments* and inseparable pleasures and miseries'—at first more pleasures, then more miseries; but it is also part of that same Truth, that the Supreme, the *Self*, by Its very *Nature*, *does* so begin, and then it ends (secondly) with *de-tach-ments* (in consequence of the stronger sense of 'miseries') from all 'finite' worldly things, and Re-tires into It-Self, in the Slumber of Chaos; and a further essential 'actional', 'ethical', part of that Truth is that, in between the 'beginning' and the (second) 'ending', *excess* should be *guarded* against, in every respect, by the soul which wishes to avoid the taste of *excessive misery*.

Other religions have degenerated also; but Hinduism, worse than others. It has millions of young and able-bodied persons who are masquerading as 'mendicant-sanyasis' of many sorts, and sinfully enjoying worldly pleasures; while the 'house-holders', even 'students', with many cares and

nobly-motived shock-tactics have failed to produce the results that were expected; and Pt. Jawaharlal's speeches and writings, voicing as they have done, only vague aspirations, have created only all sorts of cloudy hopes of a new heaven and a new earth, and very harmful misunderstandings, in the minds of the people, (as have done Mahatma Gandhi's 'Ram-raj' and 'Poor men's raj', etc., also, from another direction).¹

burdens upon them, including that of supporting, (through their own foolishness), these lawless and often vicious and even criminal parasites, are expected to, and actually do, add all sorts of great self-sacrifices, for the Congress Cause, to those cares and burdens.

¹Pt. Jawaharlal has walked into jail again, very shortly after having excellently described his first clearer glimpse of the Nature of the Goal, as above. Besides my great admiration for him as a people's leader of valiant quality, I have a personal affection for him, because there is great affection between him and my elder son, Sri Prakasa, (who also has gone to prison now for the third time), both of the same age. It makes me sad therefore to see, that he, (with thousands of others, each public-spirited, each self-denying, more or less—no other political or communal party, League, or Sabha, of India, has so many; none better; many have not even any such) should spend years upon years of his fine life in prison, without any substantial result. Of course, all such imprisonments, and other sufferings and losses, lathi-charges, shootings, confiscations, undergone with selfless motive, have their beneficial results, in the long run, for the imprisoned as well as the people. But, with human weakness, some of us want results, and more substantial results, and more quickly; and with faith in the ancient traditions and scriptures, we believe profoundly that the best results can be achieved more quickly; if our leaders, first and foremost, *define our Goal clearly*, to themselves and to all the world, and then arrange "that its true meaning and implications should be continuously explained and put before the country in language very different from that hitherto employed"—to adopt a sentence used in a very different setting, from another editorial in the *Statesman*, (d- 23-11-1940); even as khadi and charkha and the other items of Mahatma Gandhi's programme, and the various programmes of the other parties, have been and are cried all over the length and breadth of the land.

Mahatma Gandhi's Views, or, rather, absence of views, on the main point.

Mahatma Gandhi, it is well-known, has not cared up to now, to turn his attention towards any 'Planned Social Structure' even for India ; much less any 'New World Order' ; except so far as the ideas expressed in his pamphlet, *Hind Swaraj*

Pt. Jawaharlal was sentenced to *four years'* rigorous imprisonment, in Oct. 1940, at Gorakhpur, (where Mr. Amery is said to have been born), for some speech he had made much earlier. It is well known that he is pledged absolutely to non-violence in the present political struggle. He is not in sympathy with the Indian Communist Party, either ; he attacked them vigorously in speeches on 15-9-1940 and 25-9-1940. Several British newspapers condemned strongly what they described as a 'savage sentence.' American feeling was greatly aroused. *The Nation* and *The New Republic* (of New York) commented on it to the following effect, (as translated in the Hindi *Agragāmī* of Benares, d/- 24-1-1941). The former paper said that 'Jawaharlal Nehru is the leader of India next after M. Gandhi, is as opposed to Fascism-Nazism as any one can be, and thinks, like Prof. Laski, that the position of Britain would be strengthened immensely if India is made a free and willing friend and helper, instead of a discontented serf'. The latter paper said that 'Britain says to the U.S.A. two contradictory things at once ; she says that she is fighting for democracy, is giving up her own internal class-distinctions, and is looking forward to equal treatment of all ; on the other hand, she says she cannot grant freedom to India, which she promised to give twenty-three years ago, after the Great War. Britain's policy towards India is both unjust and unwise....Mr. Churchill can think of only repressive measures. This policy is harming Britain's cause in both Britain and America'. *Leader* and *Hindustan Times*, 1-10-1941, report that prominent U.S. Americans (five names are given), have been questioning the British Government, on the subject of Indian subjection, and that Mr. Amery has given the long-practised stereo-typed claptrap evasive answers.

It has been said above that it is sad to see the imprisonment of thousands of the best and most public-spirited and non-violent men of India, young, middle-aged, old, and also a number of women. One has to add that it is far sadder to contemplate the tortures suffered, in the West and the East

discussed above (pp. 333-335, *supra*) may be possible to regard as such 'planned social structure.' "One step enough for me" has been his guiding maxim. To think out what 'social structure' India needs, is a "tall order"; so he said at a Con. Cttee. meeting (Poona, 1934 ?), to a member who suggested its desirability. His 'short orders' have proved much 'taller'. The human world is now discovering, in much agony, that the very tall order of a 'New World Order' is likely to prove the best and shortest order. 'The more haste, the less speed'; 'marry in haste, repent at leisure'. Mahatma Gandhi is primarily a 'man of action'; always motivated by the highest ethics; his extremist statements of which, without the qualifications necessitated by time-place-circumstance, cause him unavoidably to fall into inconsistencies, in their practical application. He is not a 'man of thought'; in the sense of thinking out causes and effects far ahead. He concentrates his soul on the next step. He gets inspirations from within.

(China), by hundreds of thousands of equally good human beings, many of them more heroic, (judged by the ordinary standards of physical courage), whose souls have been and are being prematurely torn from their healthy, strong, active bodies, by the terrible implements of ruthless and ferocious war, on a scale for surpassing any that was ever reached before in known history. Those of us who believe in souls and other worlds, rebirths and progressive evolution, must pray fervently that the souls of all these slaughtered soldiers may pass to other worlds far happier than this miserable sphere of sins and sorrows, and, when they are born again on this earth, may find happier times amidst the conditions of a Rational New World Order. Such happier future life and rebirth are sure to be the portion of those who have fallen fighting bravely, but without rancour and hate, against the soldiers of the opposite side; fighting only because they had to obey the rulers of their respective countries, helplessly; and praying with their last breath that 'such horrors may not happen again', that humanity may grow saner, and may have wiser rulers, leaders, guides. But if they have died with hearts full of hate and wrath and murder-lust, then they will re-enact similar tragedy again, in a future life; unless their souls suffer reaction and revulsion, as happens sometimes—so the traditions say—during the superphysical life intervening between two terrene lives.

Each gives rise to a great surge of enthusiasm which sweeps all over the country. The surge of emotion, not led into any solid and substantial frame-work of reason, subsides before very long. Some of these inspirations have resulted in what Mahatma Gandhi has, with very rare moral courage and generosity, and also the self-blaming exaggeration of the saintly Christ-like spirit, called 'Himalayan blunders'. The self-justifying, self-righteous, bureaucratic maxim is, 'Never admit a mistake'; and most public leaders follow that same maxim. These mistakes have been due to this 'one-step-enough' avoidance of far-sight. He has not recognised that fact. His very great achievement has been marvellous awakening of the 'mass-mind', and abatement of 'political' terrorism; (not of 'communal' terrorism, which has increased). He has himself admitted as much in public print. Unfortunately, the awakening has been also an awakening, in very many, of the *lower* 'swa', of a craving for *personal* 'Power' (that very dangerous word); craving begotten by the misused catchword 'Freedom'; and, consequently, of great jealousies, bickerings, intrigues, dissensions, within the Congress, which are well known to all, and have been repeatedly deplored and censured by Mahatma Gandhi, also by Pt. Jawaharlal, publicly, in vain. Some prominent Congressmen themselves have told the present writer, that after the Congress took up Ministry, there has been great degeneration in the quality of the membership. All sorts of selfish, ambitious, intriguing persons, without a shred of self-denial of any kind to their credit, began coming in, by easy payment of four annas, (the only condition of membership), and wearing of a Gandhi cap, in hope and endeavour to get hold of some of 'the power and prestige' which the Congress had acquired by entering office. Mahatma Gandhi, and Pt. Jawaharlal also, suggested publicly, that there should be some scrutiny of 'quality' before admitting to membership; but, because no qualifications were specifically prescribed, the mere suggestions proved ineffective. Instead of 'sharing power and prestige', such undesirable incomers helped to ruin the prestige that the Congress had acquired by its self-sacrifices. The giving up of office by the Congress, if it had some bad results, had this good result, that it lessened the inrush of such undesirables. It must not be omitted to be noted, however, that, after all is said, the Congress remains the strongest, best organised, most-disciplined (if not quite *well-disciplined*), and most self-sacrificing body of persons in

the country; and many of its poorest members, whose names do not appear in the papers, the soldiers in the ranks, have sacrificed themselves most.

There have been rapid and extensive 'awakenings' within the last eight decades, in many countries, Japan, Norway, Turkey, Portugal, China, Russia, Italy, Germany; with very different results. The quality of the results has varied with the quality of the vision of the awakeners. The finer, clearer, more *thought-defined* and *well-motived* the vision, the better was the result. So far as it was otherwise, the results have been, to that same extent, otherwise. Every great movement has a philosophy behind it; as the philosophy, such the movement; 'ideas move the world'; 'ideas have hands and feet'; unstable, unsound, feeble, false, philosophy makes unsteady, unsound, weak, erring movement. Without the *addition* of clear thinking, the finest emotions, the noblest enthusiasms, are as steam without engine, unable to do any useful work, likely only to scald, even fatally; are as sand without cement, unable to create a stable building.

The awakening of the mass-mind; the infusing into it of the quality of fearlessness,¹ of standing up against wrong, of not cowering before aggressive arrogance, bullying, oppression; the diligent instilling into it that non-violence is the right way and the only way, in India's current *political struggle* for a *radical reform* in the form of its present Government—is all exceedingly good and desirable; and the profoundest possible gratitude of the Indian People is due to Mahatma Gandhi for it. But, in the *absence* of a fairly full *Outline of the Reform needed*, with partition of rights-and duties, work-and-remuneration, labor-and-leisure, merits-and-prizes; in the absence of specification of, and insistence on, the *qualities needed in the legislator*, to ensure, as far as is humanly possible, that he or she shall be *honest* and *self-denying* as well as *experienced*, *good* as well as *wise*—in the absence of these, all such awakening necessarily tends to go into wrong directions. 'Freedom' has come to mean 'freedom to do what *I please*'; 'independence', to mean 'rudeness'; 'self-government', to mean '*my* government', or my family's,

¹ 'The courage to resist is the price of liberty', 'the price of liberty is death'; 'they know not how to live, who know not how to die'; *abhayam sattva-samshuddhih* (Gītā); *semper vigilans*—all these mean the same thing.

or clan's, or caste's, or fellow-religionist's, or race's, or particular trade-guild's, or occupational group's or association's, like landholders', or tenants', or money-lenders', or 'oil's', or 'bus-and-lorry', or 'insurance', or 'medical', or 'legal practitioners', or 'postmen's', or 'school-teachers', or 'miners' or 'iron-masters', etc., interests. Even so, on a larger scale, the expression 'World Order', in the mouths of the dictators, (whether democratic or other), means '*my, or my nation's, World-Dominion*'. The result is—a tremendous clash of every person's and every group's and every nation's 'freedom' against every other's; instead of *an agreed regulation and limitation of every one's freedom*.

Pt. Jawaharlal has very rightly pointed out that all social reform efforts, isolated from each other, and without the background of any comprehensive *all-co-ordinating* Plan of Social Reconstruction, are all largely wasted; because they deal with the surface only of the problems, and do not go down to the root-causes. This criticism applies to Mahatma Gandhi's efforts as much as to those of 'social workers'. Worse; the fine weapon of Satyagraha has been seized hold of by all sorts of coarse-minded persons and groups, outside the Congress, and is being grossly misused; as scientific discoveries by western politicians and militarists.

In his conversation, in the last week of November, 1941, with H.E. Tai Chi Tao, President of the Examination Yuan of the Chinese Government, (who had come to India to see the Viceroy and others, and also to visit the places sacred to Buddhism, in India), Mahatma Gandhi is reported to have claimed success for his 'non-violent' methods, and recommended them for China; H.E. politely turned the conversation to other subjects. On this point, to what has been said above, the following may be added.

(a) Hindu-Muslim Unity is more distant than it was, twenty years ago, despite Mahatma Gandhi's twenty-one days' tremendous fast at Delhi in 1924. Indeed, the Dis-unity between the two communities has grown more bitter as shown in detail before.¹ To bring the two closer together, in head

¹See Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan's statement on the point, (p. 195, *supra*). It is worth noting that the outlook of the English-educated younger generation of Muslims seems, on the whole, wider than that of the corresponding generation of Hindus; and

and in heart, really and lastingly, Mahatma Gandhi should have revived the work of the Hindu-Muslim Saints, the Saints-Auliyas, Yogis-Saliks, Sufis-Vedantis ; and should have arranged, with the modern apparatus of press and platform, for much more extensive preaching and teaching of Sufi-Vedanta and Vedantic-Tasawuf, than was possible for those medieval saints. So only can the minds of the Hindu-Muslim masses be drawn away from the wretched external formalisms which divide ; and towards the inner essentials which alone unite. Mere sentimental preaching, 'Unite, Unite', or even long fasting, which arouses, at most, a temporary compassion, and the great fear that a very good and very saintly person may die, and the very valuable guidance, (whatever it's lacks), be prematurely lost to India, of the greatest spirituo-political leader that India has produced since the Congress was born—this has obviously proved of no lasting use ; has, indeed, caused serious and harmful reactions, as in Bengal and Maharashtra, over the proportions of various 'communal' and Harijan representatives. H. G. Wells also preaches, 'Unite' ; he also preaches political 'Non-violence', viz., that war should be abolished ; but he adds a 'Declaration of Rights', and some sort of a Plan, (though defective) and a very strong plea, for a 'New World Order', which the public may ponder over, and discuss and improve upon.

even the orthodox Maulavi, if really learned, is now somewhat more liberal and broad-minded than the corresponding Pandit. A certain number, though small in view of proportions, of such Muslims, is sharing in the present Congress Satyagraha and going to jail. Many large, important, and influential bodies of Muslims, like the Jamiat-ul-Ulma, and the Ahrars, are co-operating with the Congress, in the *political struggle*, though otherwise independent of it. So too are several similarly independent Hindu bodies, like the Arya Samaj, the Hindu League, (not to be confused with the Hindu Maha Sabha), and others. Both sets, of Muslim and Hindu bodies, have their differences also with the Congress, on various points. The reason of the present wider outlook and political-mindedness of Maulavis (in contrast with the Pandits) is the great political awakening and astonishing changes in the independent Muslim States of the near West. The Pandits have been getting more and more 'narrow-minded' 'conservatively defensive of their privileges', 'exclusive,' 'shrinking'.

Mr. Wells says : "It is abundantly clear that none of the existing state organisations in the world, whether democratic, pseudo-democratic, or authoritarian, are competent to carry on our collective human affairs. It is clear to all intelligent men that none of us know enough, nor have got our own minds sufficiently in order, to create a better system. All the more reason for *sustaining a storm of thought and bold discussion and enlightenment...* Are the creative and intellectual workers, the *universities*, the *teachers*, the *hunters of knowledge and wisdom*, to be at the beck and call of obscure government officials, (or) some *gangster adventurer*, some *financial trickster*, or some *vote-wangling politician* ; or are they the Masters whom it behoves all governments and social organisations to serve ? Is an enlightened World Public Opinion, instructed and sustained by a *great Educational Renaissance*, to rule a world reborn, or are these adventurers to be left free, by our silences and our disorganisation, to destroy mankind ? Is there any question that these belligerent *sovereign states* which rule us everywhere, their *bosses* and their *officials* and their *cants*, are now an *intolerable menace* to every thing worth while in human life ? The whole intellectual life of man revolts against this intolerable, suffocating, *murderous nuisance*, the *obsolescent National State*. A World-revolution to a Higher Social Order, a World Order, or utter downfall, lies before us all".¹

Mr. Wells has not seen, at least not said, that Science has become the slave, instead of the master, of the Sword, *because* the Scientist has divorced Spirituality from Science.²

It is very unfortunate for India, that our greatest leader should conceive in so limited a fashion as that of "one step", the mission entrusted to him by God. He should combine, in himself, not only the 'advancing feet' of the People, marching steadily forward, one step after another step, but should also be their very far-seeing 'eyes', fixed upon a well and widely understood, clearly visualised, goal.

(b) As to Untouchability, the surface of the problem has been barely touched ; and, in many places, very wrongly touched. Only in a few places have the public temples and wells been thrown open to the 'untouchables'. 'Separate representation', therefore 'separate quarters,' 'separate' schools, 'separate' wells,

¹*Travels of a Republican Radical in Search of Hot Water*, pp. 146-150.

²See App. A.

'separate' temples, for 'Harijans'—is the cry mostly; which only makes the *separation*, and the *differences*, worse; as in the case of Hindus-Muslims. The *lower separatist Sioa* has been awakened by the mass-awakening, everywhere, in every individual and group; *not* the *higher unitive Sioa*. The outer aggressive arrogance and assertion of superiority may have abated a little (with corresponding increase of inner resentment) among the 'orthodox high-castes'; and 'self-assertive self-respect' (tending now and then to go to the other extreme, of becoming *aggressive* in turn) may have grown somewhat among the 'Harijans'; as in the case of Britons and Indians. But the *roots* of the problem have not been touched at all. 'Mutual' untouchability and exclusiveness flourish as ever, between the hundreds of Harijan 'castes', among themselves; and between the 'high-castes' on the one side and the 'Harijans' on the other. The name 'Harijan', which, it was thought, would unify all the hundreds upon hundreds of castes of 'untouchables', has not done so at all; has only emphasised the division between 'Harijans' and 'non-Harijans', (as the words Muslim and non-Muslim, or Hindu and non-Hindu, or European and non-European, do); and, moreover, is now beginning to be resented by the 'Harijans', here and there, as being opprobrious, like 'natives'.

If Mahatma Gandhi had attacked the *root of the problem*, by preaching, and getting diligently preached all over the land, the fact that 'untouchability' attaches to dirt as such, and contagious and infectious disease, (all which too have to be touched on special occasions, for cleaning away and curing), and not to any person as such; if he had advised the people in terms of 'human being' rather than of Hindu-Muslim, Harijan-non-Harijan; if he had duly pondered the significance of the ancient fourfold vocational-class-system (by temperament, and *not by birth*), applicable to all human societies, because based on universal psychological facts and laws; if he had advised authoritatively, persistently, insistently, consistently, (as he could, with the strength of his *tapasyā*), that the so-called 'castes', whether 'high' or 'low', should *give up* their separating, dividing, antagonising 'caste-names', and should describe themselves by their *vocational* or *professional names*, as is the real original significance of the four well-known words, (*not* hereditary); if he had done so *in addition* to the preaching of non-violence and truthfulness and khadi, he might have achieved far greater and far more truly

valuable results.¹

(c) As to 'non-violence', 'khadi', etc., the extreme, unqualified, non-rationalised, mostly sentimental form in which they have been and are being preached, without reference to the all-important considerations of time-place-circumstance, and the right-and-duty of private defence of self and dependents, recognised by all law, in all times and all countries—this form is defeating its own purpose; and forcing Mahatma-ji to fall repeatedly into inconsistencies in action. Here again, only the surface of the problem has been touched, and

¹It may be worth while to note here, that, some years ago, when Dr. Ambedkar was acting as 'leader' of the 'Untouchables' or 'Depressed Classes' or 'Harijans', and was threatening to take his 'whole following', of fifty or sixty or seventy millions of souls-and-bodies, over to the fold of Islam, or Buddhism, (he did not mention Christianity), in order to press the Congress, and the Hindu Maha Sabha, etc., to give them special and separate representation, etc., the present writer, (who was, then, a member of the Central Legis. Assembly) addressed an '*open letter*' to him, through the daily press, (and also sent the original manuscript to him by registered post), to this effect: 'If you are so confident of your ability to take over so many millions at one stroke to another religion, why do you not try the far easier and simpler plan of inducing them to abandon their, now mostly senseless, separate and *separating caste-names*, and adopt the *class-caste-name* of their *professions and occupations*? Thus, at least 80 p.c. of them are 'agriculturists' by their main occupation; they should *all* call themselves *Vaishyas*; those who are in the police, the military, and such-like, should call themselves *Kshattriyas*; those who are school-masters or professors (like Dr. Ambedkar), lawyers, doctors, journalists, engineers, clerks, or in any other reading-and-writing profession, should call themselves *Brahmanas*; those in so-called menial services, or in manual-labor occupations, should name themselves simply *Shudras*. Such a change would be much simpler; would strain the loyalty and obedience of your followers much less; would abolish Untouchability at one stroke; and would *restore rationality to and re-form all Hinduism*'. This writer never received any reply from Dr. Ambedkar, either by private letter, or by public writing in the press.

very ineffectively. Even in the political struggle, where it is most appropriate, non-violence is not only regarded in the Congress, as the best and only possible policy, but is also largely superficial. This, Mahatma Gandhi has himself clearly recognised and declared. And khadi continues to be very largely a spoon-fed industry, in the towns; though it is very useful in the villages, provided a sufficient supply of cotton is available, as it is not, always and everywhere, in consequence of the existing rent and revenue system. The subject of unqualified non-violence has been fully discussed before.¹

¹To what has been said before, from time to time, on the subject, the following may be added. The Puranic legends say: Hiranya-Kashipu was a great Daitya (Titan) tyrant. He brought the whole earth under his sole despotic sway. He forbade the worship of any God other than himself. He had a son named Prahlâda. This son, from very childhood, was a devotee, by instinct, of the Vishnu form of Divinity. The worship of Vishnu was particularly prohibited by Hiranya-Kashipu; because there was a prophecy that Vishnu would slay Hiranya-Kashipu. The father tried to wean the son from the worship, by every method, of persuasion, warning, threat; did not succeed. Then he resorted to torture, and ultimately tried to kill him, in many ways. The boy always escaped miraculously. One day, the father had the son brought before him, and challenged him to show how his favorite Vishnu, who, the boy was always saying, was omnipresent, was present in the great stone pillars of the hall. Forthwith, from one of the pillars, burst out a huge Man-Lion, Nara-Simha, who tore Hiranya-Kashipu in pieces. The legend is interpreted in various ways, to bring it within familiar experience and reason; as, f.i., the boy had secretly brought up a pet lion. Another way to rationalise it is, that 'God helps those who *cannot* help themselves'; 'out of the tears of the oppressed and helpless, the God Rudra (personification of 'Wrath', perhaps the same word, etymologically) is born'; when even helpless children are subjected to torture, then the Mass-Man becomes a Lion at last, and destroys the tyrant. In short, *some* may suffer non-violently, meekly, through extreme cowardice, or through extreme heroism; for extremes meet; but *others* are bound, by the Law of Nature's God, sooner or later, to avenge and redress the great wrong, by Righteous, Defensive, *legal* and *penal* 'Violence', which overwhelms the tyrannical Violence of

Ré khāḍī and spinning, after twenty years' experiments and experience, general opinion seems to have crystallised into this, that khāḍī is very fine and effective as a 'uniform', but is hopeless as a solution of the economic problem, for it

the despot. To hope that Non-Violence, pure and simple, will ever, by itself, conquer and abolish violence—is an utterly futile hope, shown to be such by all history and all metaphysic. Such is the lesson of it all. The War of the gods and the titans is being ever renewed, ever pacified. Sisyphus, Tantalus, Walhalla, Satan and Michael and the other archangels, Ormuzd and Ahriman (strictly, Spenta-mainyu and Anghra-mainyu)—the myths and legends of all peoples dramatise the same laws and facts, of Repetition, Distant Ideal, Duality.

The simplest and easiest way to abolish Violence from the earth, would be for the Great Mystery to create only sheep and no tigers and wolves. *If* Nature would produce only non-violent human beings, and no violent ones, then everything would become fine. So long as that primary and essential *if* is not satisfied, through any one's *tapasyā* or *ahimsā-pratishthā*, will-force or soul-force, none of the other *ifs*, which have been put forward as conditions for the abolition of Violence, will be satisfied; they are, all of them, infinitely more difficult than the primal *if*. Pending that impossible consummation, God's Nature ordains that the sheep and the deer must learn to grow and use horns, as some varieties, the big-horn or ibex, f.i., of the snow-hills, and the gnu or gemsbok of Africa, have learnt; and as cattle, especially buffaloes, and particularly those accustomed to browse in the forests, and to pass nights there in herds, have done most effectively. Another and simpler way of Nature, to keep Violence in check, is to destroy tiger by tiger, titan by titan. In this last way, God very often helps those who *cannot* help themselves. Thieves must fall out, some day, sooner or later, so that honest men also may have a chance, may have their turn. The Puranic 'legend' of the two dearly beloved titan-brothers, Sunda and Upa-sunda, immortal otherwise than by each other's hands, who ultimately slew each other, because each wanted the heavenly nymph Tiloṭṭamā ('fertile land, rich in oil'), who was specially created by Deity to tempt them—is the typus of a good deal of history. The tremendously overgrown European Powers are following that way today. It is the necessary preparation for the World-Federation. The

cannot cure Indian poverty; and that spinning is good, as one among other ways, of training young eyes and fingers, and also as a *supplementary* bread-earning occupation for grown-up men and women, women especially, who may have nothing more lucrative or useful to fill idle hours; and would save them from wasting their energies in quarrelling, drinking, gambling, and other such vicious addictions.

Sidelight on the possibility of spinning as a panacea for India's economic problem is given by S. Upadhyay, in an article on 'The Home of Ahimsa', published in *The Hindustan Standard*, (quoted in Dr. G. S. Arundale's *New India Survey*, 8-2-1941). Of the village of Shegaon, in which Gandhiji lives, "Mr. Upadhyay writes:

'Of economic relief, nothing has been offered to the villagers. Debts mount; difficulties multiply. By spinning, Mahatma Gandhi thinks, one can earn his living. A spinning class was opened in the Ashram. Men and women, even boys and girls, were invited to spin. I found some of them spinning from morning to evening, and this netted them one anna and a half each a day. Spinning, truly speaking, is too primitive a method to solve the economic difficulties. That was all that *eight months* at Shegaon (now renamed Sévā-grām, 'the village of service') made me think.'

This friend of Gandhiji's Ashram whose article on the whole is highly complimentary, ends on a pessimistic note:

'India watches Shegaon with wonder; many a fateful decision is hammered out in the lonely cottage..The Harijans live, and their life is still an Iliad of woes.' ..'

The perpetual Un-prepared-ness of the Congress leaders.

This again illustrates the need for 'planning systematically'. Shri Rajagopalachari admitted, in the *Hindustan Times*, shortly after resigning Ministership, that opportunities and occasions for real positive constructive work, have always

Puranic legends show that Brahma, the Creator, never grants absolute immortality to the physical body of any one, however devoted. He grants all kinds of immunities, *specifically* asked for; and a way, not thus guarded against, appears, as soon as the devotee begins to *misuse* his God-given powers, for oppressing Humanity, to slay him. Every Achilles must have a vulnerable heel. The colossus of brass must have feet of clay. One here, one there, overgrown, begins to think he can cheat or beat Nature; Nature always overpowers him, soon or late.

found the Congress 'un-prepared'. This writer's own experience of seven sessions, in Delhi and Simla, of the Central Legislature, is, that the Congress Party only helped to keep hot, all over the land, the spirit of negative opposition; very desirable, very necessary, but also very insufficient. There was opportunity for solid substantial positive and constructive social, reformist, and especially educational, legislation; but it was wholly neglected by the Congress Party, despite the efforts of some members to induce it to take interest therein.

It is India's great misfortune that her leader of leaders should have given his high soul much more to *bhakti* and *karma*, (*ibādāt and khidmat*), 'devotion' and 'action'; and not as much to *jñāna*, (*irfān*), the 'Ancient Wisdom'; that he should see and show only the 'Way to Truth', and not also the Truth itself; that he should have worshipped God, mostly in the aspect of the Merciful, (*Rahīm, Dayālu*), and not equally in that of the Ruler and Regulator and Law-Giver (*Muqaddir, Vidhātā*). This is the more unfortunate since this *Jñāna*, this Wisdom, (as *applicable* for the just administration of all *human affairs*, economic as well as others) is available, in the form of *universal principles*, in the books left by the ancient Sages and Seers, and is not far to seek; though it needs greatly to be newly and closely studied, and discriminatingly interpreted, in the light of modern western knowledge and recent and current history; for it is just the neglect and perversion of those principles, which has changed the old social organisation of India from a supernal blessing into an infernal curse.

The luminous fire of the Wisdom, the Truth, (*Vidyā, Ilm, Irfān*), is Eternal. But it requires new 'personal' fuel for periodical renewal, in order to shine forth again, after the old fuel is burnt out. Such 'personal' fuel is the asceticism, (*Tapas, Zohd, Taqushshuf*), and passionate and compassionate self-sacrifice, of Missioners, like Mahatma Gandhi, through whom the hidden Light might shine forth.

But, alas!, it is not given by God's Nature, to any one individual to be perfect, able to do everything. Great virtues generally go with great deficiencies. Very, very, rare have been the really Great Missioners and Messengers who have been able to combine Devotion, Action, and Wisdom equally.

*Mahatma Gandhi's confession of inability
to give a Definition of Swa-raj.*

It is very depressing, very humiliating, that India's

greatest leader, her leader of leaders, should have to confess, (as he did in his speech to the A. I. C. C., on 16 Sept. 1940, in Bombay) ; " I cannot give you a definition of Swaraj. I have not been able to define Swa-raj " ; that he should endeavour to lead his people to something, the nature and meaning of which he does not know, and therefore cannot explain to his followers *what* he is trying to lead them to.

It does not appear what the occasion was, which induced him to make this confession. Presumably, the question was pressed upon him by some leading members, possibly by Pt. Jawaharlal himself. Any way, it may be inferred that the vitally important question is beginning, though very late, to occupy the minds of some members of the A.I.C.C. ; otherwise it would not have been touched by Mahatma Gandhi at all. This is a very good sign that prominent members are beginning to be dissatisfied with meaningless catchwords; beginning to look ahead ; *to think* ; to try to *understand* the meaning and *purpose* of all their enthusiasm, activities, struggles. Most unfortunately, because of their natural reverence (which this writer shares whole-heartedly) for the spiritual and moral greatness of Mahatma Gandhi, these Congress leaders go to the very wrong extreme (which he cannot sympathise in) of never venturing to say anything which might look like a 'criticism' or contradiction of him, or might in any way displease him, or cause him to think that the Congress members were not doing their duty, not keeping their towns, districts, provinces, up to the mark ; just like bureaucratic subordinates, who make false reports to the 'barra sahibs', that 'sab thik hai, huzur', 'everything is all right', 'all is going well', while they know very well, all the time, that mischief is brewing. This has helped to cause many of the 'blunders' of the past. Fortunately, 'opposition', moral courage to express dissent, publicly, with readiness to obey the rules of 'discipline', has latterly been growing in the Congress. Pt. Jawaharlal has, time and again, led the way, in this respect; and, at last, Shri Rajagopalachari, Maulana Azad, and others have followed. But this healthy developement seems to have come very (is it too?) late ; and to be, as yet, very insufficient. One can only say, 'Better late than never', and continue to hope that 'It is never too late to mend'.

Mahatma Gandhi went on to say, in his speech above quoted from : "The right of free speech and civil liberty must be available to every one;...one must have the right to

propagate what he thinks right, provided he does not preach violence..." The proviso gives the case away very largely, and makes room for *law* to step in ; it admits that speech ought not to be too free ; that its freedom has to be limited ; that 'civil liberty' of many kinds needs to be specified and modified from time to time, through legislation, by a competent legislature.

Why not appoint a Committee to define ?

If Mahatma Gandhi really wants to "know from any one who can give (it) a comprehensive definition of Swaraj", it is very easy for him to appoint a very small Committee, to report to him such a definition, within a couple of months at most, if not a single month.¹ It need not and ought not to be, like a Bureaucratic roving Commission, which, with immense display of mountainous labor does not bring forth even a mouse ; recommends, with much pompous and stilted language, small changes in paltry details ; after touring about all over the country in luxurious railway cars ; and generally enjoying itself at the expense of the public, for months and months.

Modern Democracies.

As said before, the most widely accepted, the best and most comprehensive, western definition of Swaraj or Self-government, is President Abraham Lincoln's : "Government of the People, for the People, by the People". The serious deficiency in it is connected with the word "by". Obviously, it *cannot* possibly mean "by the *whole* of the People". In democratic practice, it has come to mean, "by the *elected representatives* of the People". Here again, it is fairly obvious, and will probably not be seriously disputed by any one, that these elected representatives ought to be '*good and wise*' ; for such law-makers alone can make 'good and wise' laws ; which alone can secure and spread general welfare and 'organise for peace'. Bryce, in his large and authoritative two volume book, *Modern Democracies*, repeatedly describes the great desideratum, by such pairs as '*character and talent*', '*genius and virtue*', '*uprightness and public spirit* as well as *intellect*' ; and laments that philosophers from Plato downwards, in the

¹A hope has arisen, as indicated before, p. 290, *supra*, that such a Committee may be appointed now, before very long. The above text was drafted and typed out, with other parts, out of which this last portion of the book is being made up, long before the break in work mentioned at p. 289.

west, while positing this ideal, have "never succeeded in showing how the possessors of these qualities are to be found and chosen". It is reported that, sometime ago, Mahatma Gandhi, criticising a suggestion to this same effect by Dr. G.S. Arundale, queried "But who will certify the goodness and wisdom"? The answer to this has been given before (p. 29, *supra*).¹ Any way, the Committee, to be appointed for the purpose, should be asked to report on this crucially important point also, viz., "Who is to certify the Goodness and the Wisdom : and what are the Marks thereof?" But it may be noted that, without the setting, the background, of some such psychologically scientific World-Order, i.e., Social Organisation, it will not be possible to ensure an adequate supply of such selfless as well as experienced persons, fit to be chosen, as well as of many more other persons, competent to 'certify' them, to choose and select and elect them.

The Principles of such a Social Organisation may be found very briefly outlined in a few paragraphs (and explained in the Appendix thereto) of "The Outline Scheme of Swaraj", published by Deshbandhu C. R. Das and this writer in 1923.² A dozen recent western writers might be quoted to show that western thought is turning towards a closer "study of the social merits and defects of the Indian system, (which) may have more to contribute to politics of the future than, as heirs to a supposedly superior political heritage, we are, at present inclined to admit"; Ross Nichols, in *History of Our Times*.

¹Other western writers who also, like Bryce, desiderate 'goodness and wisdom' in the legislator, are quoted in this writer's pamphlet, *The Ethico-Psychological Crux in Political Science and Art*. 'The marks of goodness and wisdom', and other vital matters, are dealt with in it, on the basis of the indications contained in the old Samskrit books.

²Six thousand copies of this "Outline Scheme" were distributed by Mahatma Gandhi himself, (in 1926, if I remember rightly, the cost being paid by Shri Shiva Prasad Gupta of Benares) with *Young India*. The whole of that Scheme may be regarded as a "comprehensive definition of Swaraj", in the way of an application of the *principles*, above alluded to, to the special conditions and requirements of India. Of course, the Scheme was not gospel; was *merely tentative*; but it could well serve as a *basis for discussion*. It is deeply to be regretted that while Mahatma Gandhi graciously thought the

A dear friend, a good Congress worker, wrote some time back : "You are anxious that Swaraj should be defined. May I suggest the following : A state of affairs in which a majority of the elected representatives of a people, living in a definite piece of territory, shall have the power to determine from time to time and enforce a system of governance and *social order* which they regard as most suitable for the people and as conducive to their best interests". This is only Abraham Lincoln's definition with a little further clarification and specification. But it needs more expansion and improvement yet, by the addition of words making it clear that only

Scheme worthy to be circulated with *Young India*, he did not think it worth while to start a systematic discussion on it, which would have given very valuable widespread education to 'public opinion', to the 'mass-mind', in 'constitution-making'. This writer remembers distinctly, that when he pressed upon Mahatma-ji, by letters, the desirability of his initiating such a discussion, he wrote to this writer, mentioning the limits of space in the paper, and asking him to "point out a single word in the past issues which could well have been omitted". This writer had the temerity to write back that, with all respect, he was convinced that there was not one single word so far printed in *Young India*, which dealt with any matter *more important* than the subject of the "Scheme of Swaraj", and that, in any case, whatever had been done in the past, the future issues of the paper might very well spare room for this purpose. There was no reply to that. At last, and at least, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru has realised that importance. Is it too late?

Further in January, 1927, this writer had the honor of a long interview with Mahatma Gandhi, in Benares, and placed before him the above-described interpretation of the words "by the people." He *agreed* as to the qualifications needed in the persons to be elected. But he could not be persuaded to take intensive and extensive steps to educate the electorates accordingly, in the same way that he was educating the people regarding khāḍī and charkhā. This writer has never been able to understand the abstruse reasons he advanced for this abstention of his. The electorate certifies the 'goodness and wisdom' of those whom it elects ; but it must be properly educated beforehand, as to what the marks of goodness and wisdom are ; 'the outward symbols of the inward grace.' See App. D.

representatives, whose 'goodness and wisdom' has been *tested*, shall be elected by electorates *duly educated* in this behalf, in accordance with rules which shall ensure the election of such, as far as is humanly possible.

The Struggle-Measures of Mahatma Gandhi and the recurring question—What for?

Mahatma Gandhi's strategic measures, his tactics, may be the finest, the noblest, the most ethically admirable, the most dignified, in the world. But the question always recurs—*What for?* The army-commanders and the scientists of the belligerents in the current war, are all very busily engaged in thinking out devices for defeating the adversary. If asked, *What for?*, those of the British reply, "For victory". Yes; but *after* victory? Whatever may be the views of the great rulers and statesmen and politicians who are twirling the nations round their little fingers (unconscious that they themselves are puppets in the hands of Omnipotent and Omniscient Matter or Spirit—exactly the same thing); the civilian peoples (who are the worst sufferers) of the warring countries, especially of Britain, are asking, "What ultimate purpose, what ultimate Good, are we fighting for?". And there is much reason to believe that many of the combatant soldiers and officers also are searching their heads and their hearts, and questioning their companions and chaplains, in some such words. Philip Gibbs' terrible book, *The Realities of War*, relating to the World War of 1914-1918, contains pages after pages of such questionings and discussions by the wounded and the unwounded soldiers and officers, in the hospitals and the trenches on the British and French side, and also in the letters found on dead or wounded and captured German soldiers and officers.

Now and again, Congressmen (some M.L.A.s among them) have come to this writer and discussed the question, "What exactly is the Congress struggling for; what is the meaning of *Swaraj*?" They have not been able to say what they understand exactly by *Swaraj*. This writer told them that he had been explaining in scores and scores of articles in the journals, in Hindi and English, in pamphlets, in books, during the last twenty years, what he himself thinks we *should* struggle for; that they have been too pre-occupied with 'acting' to have time and inclination for reading these and for 'thinking'; and that they should question the Congress leaders, and particularly Mahatma Gandhi, on the

subject, by means of formal resolutions of their local committees, to induce them to give an authoritative statement, as to what exactly the Congress was actually struggling for; what was the 'content' of the word 'Swaraj'. But they have been afraid to do so. Apparently, the sentimental and other reasons, before mentioned, are the only reason (or rather 'un-reason') for their avoidance of the plain and straight course. Some said they had read the articles, and agreed also with the views; and, in any case, with the demand that 'Swaraj' should be defined authoritatively by the Congress A.I.C.C. and Mahatma Gandhi; but they could not make up their minds to press the demand in the way suggested. One of the very prominent Congress workers and U. P. leaders, Shri Purushottam Das Tandon, (who had then recently been elected Speaker of the U.P. Assembly) in his Convocation address at the Kashi Vidya Pitha, in 1937, clearly said that omission to define and specify the sort of Swaraj wanted, was causing much misunderstanding and doing great moral harm. The editorials of the influential and well-circulated (Hindi daily) *Aj*, of Benares, have also all along consistently supported this writer's plea.

In October, 1940, this writer received a letter from a Congressman in a jail in the U.P., in which he said: "It is only here in the jail that I have got a chance to coolly think over all our present political difficulties, and the thing that has struck me most is *our lack of any definite Scheme of Swaraj*...I think you were right...(though) you have not succeeded in your labor".

Mahatma Gandhi and the desired Constituent Assembly.

Mahatma Gandhi may well consider the question in this aspect: *If*, in consequence, possibly, of a great change of heart and of head, and the pressure of public opinion in the U.S.A. on the higher mind of Britain, due to Mahatma Gandhi's Satyagraha; or, may be, in consequence of a sudden 'conversion of spirit' resulting from the tremendous new World-War and the unspeakable horrors and agonies connected therewith; if it should happen that 'Swaraj' (whatever it may mean), suddenly falls into Mahatma Gandhi's hands; *if* he is then able, leisurely and peacefully, to call together his Constituent Assembly; and *if* he is elected a member of that Assembly, as he is sure to be, first and foremost; *what then*, as such member, would he say, to the Constituent Assembly, should be the 'content' of Swaraj, its several main policies, its general

form and chief features? Surely he would say something, would put forward his own proposals, on these matters. Why not make these proposals now? Is it impossible that those proposals *may* appear so just and reasonable and helpful to all, British and Indian, Hindus and Muslims, men and women, young and old, head-worker and hand-worker, alike, that they may all agree upon them, and fling aside their present artificial antagonisms?

Or will Mahatma Gandhi sit silent in that Constituent Assembly? Or will he propose his old idea of 'Hind Swaraj', with abolition of all machinery, administrative and legislative as well as metallic?

Or will he say, now: 'I decline to entertain all these *If's*; I am a one-step man; I will go on with my Satyagraha till Swaraj drops into my hands; only then will I try to understand what it means?'

If that should unhappily be his attitude, then persons of another way of thinking can only put aside all hope of the redemption of the Indian People by him, and cry to the Supreme Mystery to send some greater Missioner, who not only marches one step at a time, but sees the main broad details of the Goal, as well as of the way to it, a thousand steps ahead, and is therefore able to unite the people effectively in a *common effort*; by giving them the solid *common economic interest* of assured and sufficient *livelihood*, in addition to the noble *common moral and sentimental interest* of secure *self-dependence* and 'freedom'; and lead them in a direction, which is understood and recognised by all as right.

The Case of China.

After the establishment of the Republic by Dr. Sun Yat Sen in 1911-12, China, far better off than India in many important respects, suffered for sixteen years and more from internal chaos and from dangers of being partitioned into 'spheres of influence' by western 'Powers'. She has been *saved therefrom* by the Japanese aggressions and invasions, and by Japan's warnings to those other Powers to keep 'hands off Asia generally, and China particularly', and, lastly, by those causes which have led to the outbreak of the new World-War in Europe. Now, for the last ten years or so, under the guidance of the Supreme Mystery which works by astonishing contraries, creates corn out of manure, music out of catgut, and heroes out of horrors, China is becoming unified and solidarised, under the regime of Marshal Chiang Kai Shek,

through the agonising trials of those invasions. To the feeble minds of some of us, all this long-drawn agony seems due mainly to the fact that Dr. Sun Yat Sen had not the opportunity of educating, in good time, his very ancient, very patient, and very wonderfully heroic people, in the scientific principles and the broad details of a wise World Order, such as was prescribed for India by her Sages and Seers, thousands of years ago, but could not be carried over and placed before the Sages of China for consideration, by the Buddhist missionaries. China has for long had a fine social organisation of her own; not unlike the Indian in some respects. She has avoided the gross perversion and corruption—the one cause of all India's miseries—into which India fell, viz. the perversion of *temperamental* profession, vocation, occupation, into *hereditary* caste. But she developed other abuses—she could not properly divide, could not keep separate, the four main social labors, the four functions of the four main professions, the learned, the executive, the commercial, the industrial; she could not partition rights-and-duties strictly and justly between them; and she gradually reduced the vital part of the 'executive', the soldier, the 'defender', to the position of an outcast. Hence her sorrows and trials. So is India suffering for her many similar as well as different and worse sins.

If Mahatma Gandhi and our other leaders would avoid worse chaos and civil wars in India, than those of China, if they would save the Indian People from awful torments, they should begin thinking out *now*, the policies of Swaraj, in broad details. Already too much time has been lost.

CHAPTER X.

More British Views on the Meaning of 'A Better World', or a 'New World Order.'

Reuter reported, on 27 Nov., 1940, that "On the question of War Aims, Cabinet Minister Mr. Duff Cooper said: When a man is set upon by two gangsters in a dark street, and finds himself fighting for life, he is hardly in a mood to turn aside and explain to some benevolent enquirer exactly *What he is fighting for*. But there is no reason why we should not indulge in *some speculation (now) as to what may come after*. Since the war will to a large extent *destroy Europe and perhaps the world*, we, *when it is over*, will resolve to *build a better world* in its place, to solve the problems that seemed unsolvable, to profit even by destruction itself, which will have cleared the way for those whose task it will be to build again". Always that disastrous *after*! It will be *very* late, then; probably, *too* late.

If Mr. Duff Cooper was convinced, and spoke out, as the unconscious mouth-piece of Providence, what the extreme socialists-communists believe and wish, viz., that present-day "Europe and the world" must necessarily be *destroyed, before* there will be a chance to build again, then obviously, nothing more can be said to him. His declaration that "we *will* resolve to build a better world, after the war is over", and *after* "Europe and perhaps *the world*" has been *destroyed*, is a futile self-contradiction. Who will be left to rebuild?

But Mr. Cooper's own better mind admitted the desirability of "speculating" *now*, as to what the shape of the "better world" *should be, after* the war; and thereby implicitly conceded that his simile, of "two gangsters," etc., was *not* apt. *Many* of his fellow-M. P's. think and say that the work could and should have been done *long ago*, to *prevent* the war, and ought to be done *now*, to *stop* it; and that to avoid doing so, is only evasion and obduracy.

On 7-12-1940, in the course of a debate in the House of Commons, Lord Privy Seal Mr. Attlee said, "We want to build a New World", in reply to Mr. McGovern's demand for a statement of War Aims. Build on what lines, he did not say.

He repeated this idea, speaking in London, on 15-1-1941: "We have got to move into a New World. You are never going to get back to pre-war 1939. This war is a fight by people who want different things—things inimical to each other. *There is a lot of planning in Nazism*, but there is *not the spirit of liberty* that makes for *human freedom*. I profoundly believe in this nation. You can get our fullest effort only by utilising to the utmost our spirit of liberty". But what Mr. Attlee's conception of the New World is—he does not say; though the Labor Party, of which he was presumably a member before he took office, clearly said long ago, what their conception of its Fundamentals was; (see p. 118-9, *supra*). Very probably, a Nazi speaker would be using much the same language in Berlin. Only instead of 'Nazism', he would say 'Capitalist-Militarist-Imperialism'. For proof "that there is not the spirit of liberty that makes for *human freedom*", he would point to India; as, in fact, Hitler has done; (see p. 16, *supra*). If Mr. Attlee really believes in "utilising to the utmost our spirit of Liberty", he should utilise to the utmost his own spirit of liberty by insisting that the Cabinet, of which he is an important member now, should accept the Labor Party's manifesto as its own, and give effect to the First Suggestion made in this book, viz., that the British Government should declare full Dominion Status for India, now, at once, with the conditions mentioned before. If this is done, the whole politico-moral atmosphere of the whole world will change from evil to good, from miasmatic to ozonic, at once. In the second place, he should clearly set forth before the world, his own conception of the New World that he wants, if he differs from the Labor Party. If he thus sets forth his own conception, then it will appear at once whether it is or is not better than the "lot of planning in Nazism", and it will also be made plain who wants World-Dominion, and who the General Welfare of Britons and Germans *both*, alike, *as well as of all the other Peoples* of this earth.

In the meanwhile, during the lurid, sorry, blood-hate-and-greed-blinded years of *preparation* for this ghastly war, and the war of Japan on China, and now, during the agonising, frenzied, maniac months and years of their *actual* waging and raging; there has *not been, nor is*, any 'freedom', any 'spirit of liberty', either in Germany, or in Britain, or in Italy, or in France, or in Japan, or even in China. The spirit and the practices of Martial Law; *mental* as well as physical 'drilling'; social and

other pressure and compulsion ; lying propagandism ; 'no scruples', only 'victory', 'defeat the foe at all costs', by all means, fair and foul, open war, deceitful stratagems, fifth columns, domestic espionage ; regimentation, martinetism, dragooning ; have been rampant in the countries of *all* the belligerents ; in Germany and Italy more violently, brutally, openly, to the extent of concentration-camps, tortures, assassinations ; in Britain and France, mildly, in more respectably disguised and decent conventional forms. Since the passing, as was inevitable, on 24-8-1939 and 22-5-1940, of the socialising Emergency Powers Acts, by the British Parliament, in single short sittings ; the Acts which place all the private property, and all the working capacity, of every citizen, at the disposal of the Government ; there has been, obviously, in *theory*, as complete a 'dictatorship' in Britain as could possibly be. But, of course, in *practice*, the powers of the Government are being exercised much more mildly and considerately than they have been and are being (by all available reports) exercised in Germany and Italy. After all, there has been, even in the last few decades, comparatively, more unfettered thinking, sense of 'justice, equity, and good conscience' and shame of inequitous conduct, side by side with imperialism, capitalism, militarism, and nationalism, in Britain, than in any other country ; though, it should be borne in mind, if the jail-experiences of not a few of the Satyagraha prisoners and detenus, since 1921, in *India*, were published, it might be found that they were not very far behind those of the concentration-camps of Germany ; without mentioning the preceding Amritsar Massacre, Martial law doings, and shootings, etc., in other towns. But the longer the war continues, the more must all belligerents become brutalised. During war-time, the soldiers of *any* and *every* nation, inevitably tend to brutality, loot, rape, sadistic cruelty, murder of the innocent, as well as slaughter of the combatant ; and the executive, generally, to callousness.

The utterances quoted above, may be capped with the most authoritative of all such, a pronouncement by Mr. Churchill himself—marvellously vigorous and active in mind as well as body, despite sixty-eight years of age, very versatile, very eloquent with both pen and tongue, traveller, hunter, soldier, author, parliamentarian, very warlike Premier and War-time Dictator of Britain. Speaking at his old school, Harrow, on 20-12-1940, he said : "*When* this war is won—as it surely will be—it will be one of our aims to

establish a state of society, where the advantages and privileges, which hitherto have been enjoyed only by a few, shall be far more widely shared by the men and youth of the nation as a whole".¹ The newspaper report does not

¹The *Theosophist*, for January, 1941, has published an extract from *The People* (Britain) d/- 22-9-1940. It is to this effect: "The Government of Britain is gathering together a Committee of Experts...for the creation of a new and better *Britain after* the war. A member of the War Cabinet, or a Cabinet, or a senior Minister without Portfolio, is to be placed in charge...Far-reaching changes and reorganisations are to be carried out...*Britain* will pass...into an entirely *New Social System*. It will be not Socialism, not Capitalism...nor Nazism...but a *New System*, in which public ownership and control will be blended with private enterprise,...social services will be extended,...there will be a wider conception of *Social Justice*". Then twelve heads of 'measures' are enumerated. They deal with specific details, (1) rebuilding of damaged towns, (2) creation of new towns, (3) redistribution of industrial population, (4) extension of agriculture, (5) better social insurance schemes, (6) a fair wage court, (7) State control of vital industries, (8) widespread public work schemes for demobilised soldiers *after* the war, (9) Revision of Educational system, to give opportunities to working class children to go to Eton, Harrow, etc., (10) technical training for demobilised soldiers, (11) public work schemes against unemployment, and (11) rural holiday camps for town-dwellers. There is no mention of any *all-governing* general psychological and scientific principles; and the 12th item, which ruins all and 'lets the cat out of the bag', is, "A *bigger army, navy, and air-force* to be kept in commission—possibly with a modified form of national service". All these measures are not very different from what Stalin and Mussolini and Hitler have done for their countries. They are all very good so far as the internal improvement goes, in details; but the *co-ordinating, synthesising, lubricating, humanising, psychological principles* are lacking, as in Russia, Germany, Italy. They mean that *Britain* must become, not only prosperous within her own borders, but *stronger* than all those other countries. The inspiring motive is, as before, 'nationalist', not 'humanist', and can only lead to worse and worse armament races, and greater and greater mischief in the future. If a *quick ending*

make it clear whether, by the word 'nation', he meant *every nation* within the influence of the winning nation, or only the winning nation. But it is obvious that he meant only the British nation. Mr. Churchill's past reputation is that of a very imperious imperialist, capitalist, militarist, and nationalist; by no means that of a humanist; also it is that of one who is particularly *not* in sympathy with the aspirations of India. In his very interesting, book, *My African Journey*, (1908), he makes, now and then, wise political observations, even benevolent, regarding the Indians. Thus: "Is it possible for any Government with a scrap of respect for honest dealing between man and man, to embark upon a policy of deliberately squeezing out the native of India from regions in which he has established himself under every security of public faith?...He was here long before the first British official...We are in presence of one of those apparently hopeless antagonisms of interests which baffle and dispirit all who are concerned in their adjustment...A whole series of new problems

of the current war is sincerely desired, then the inspiring motive should be *not only* 'a new and better Britain', but a 'new and better human world; not a new drawing of political boundaries on the world's map, in favor of Britain, but a re-adjustment of the social and economic relations between the sections of each nation; the Committee should consist of *not only British Experts*, but of the '*most Philanthropic Experts* (experts especially in *all aspects of Human Nature*) of *all countries*'; not "a bigger army, navy, air force", but, instead, a *much smaller*, sufficient only for purposes of internal order, and *General Disarmament* to the utmost, such as even the Pope and the Archbishops of Christendom have now urged. In short, an Armistice or Truce should be arranged, without delay, and an International Committee of persons who are, *not only 'Experts'* in particular technical sciences, *but are also* genuinely *philanthropic* and *humanist* (*not nationalist*) in outlook, and are wise in understanding of both the good and the evil in human beings, should be gathered and set to work at once. If this is not done, the War will continue costing Humanity, *every day*, some thirty to forty million pounds worth of human labor and some thousands of lives of combatants and *non-combatants*, and causing ever greater brutalisation of whole nations, till, very likely, all are plunged in another Dark Age.

has arisen which will grow graver and larger...Unless these new elements in the *economic life of mankind* can be *scientifically and harmoniously controlled*, great and novel dangers menace alike Asiatic and European...Very close behind lie the appeals to force, by mobs or Empires, to decide in a *brutal* fashion the *brutal question* which of *two irreconcilable interests* shall prevail...The world is big enough...There is plenty of room for all. Why cannot we settle it fairly?... Guided by the lights of *Science and Tolerance*, we may easily find...the course of sound policy"; (ch. iii). He regrets the "lack of *foresight and of a comprehensive view*, (which) leaves its permanent imprint upon the countenance of a new country"; (p. 19); and, in the subsequent chapters, recurs again and again to the fact that Science and Administration, in benevolent co-operation, could improve the lot of mankind immensely. But he seems to have forgotten all such benevolent humanitarianism; and the element of nationalist imperialism has hardened and grown in him, with advancing age, till it has overpowered all the other and fine elements.

Prof. Laski (in an article reproduced in the *Hindustan Times* of 23-1-1941, from the *Tribune* of London) said: "...The black spot in the (British) Government's record remains India. There is a change in the manner of Mr. Amery's approach; there is no real change in the substance of the policy offered...We *protest* that we *seek* India's freedom at the *earliest possible moment*. We have *not* really *taken one step* to secure it. Yet the advantages of a free India in full partnership with Britain are overwhelming...But in the end we shall have to give way. For no one is going to set limits to the march of a people...I wish I could understand what it is that *bedevils Mr. Churchill's mind* whenever he touches India...Do the British Government regard with equanimity the idea of concentration-camps in India under their auspices?..."¹

¹We have noted before, that the words "All Nations", and their equivalents, appear *five* times in the eight-point agreement, arrived at between Pt. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, at their secret meetings in the President's ship, on the Atlantic, in August, 1941. Lord Privy Seal Mr. Attlee (Laborite), a few days later, clearly expounded to the British public, that "All Nations" included "all the peoples of Asia and Africa"; this of course includes the people of India.

The *Leader* (Allahabad) of 23-1-1941, published a report, under the caption, 'Post-War Reconstruction', to the effect that "Mr. Churchill is not over-looking the problem of post-war reconstruction, and is ready, *when a good opportunity*

But, subsequently, Mr. Churchill went back dietatorially upon that plain and honest interpretation, and said that the case of India would be governed by the conditions already laid down by the British Government. The result has been great resentment even among the Moderates, even among the Loyalists, in India. Even Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan, Premier of Punjab, voices his indignation, (*Hindustan Times*, 2-10-1941), and suggests that "(1) Mr. Churchill should issue a *fresh declaration* that India shall attain the status of equal partnership in the British Commonwealth, within *two or three years after the War*; and (2) that a *select body*, representative of *all important interests* in the country, including the British, should be set up, to hammer out an *agreed Constitution*; and, in the event of its failure to do so, within the prescribed time, the British Government shall, in collaboration with those elements which help in the Defence of India, devise a suitable Constitution conferring full Dominion Status on India". Mr. Churchill could safely do that; he could always find that new conditions had arisen which made it necessary to replace the words 'two or three years after the war', by the words 'at the earliest possible moment' and 'as soon as a favorable opportunity presents itself'.

Sir S. H. Khan has not yet learnt the value of 'declarations' by the British Government, or by 'politicians' everywhere. Even the most solemn and elaborate *Treaties* become 'scraps of paper' at the will of any party to them. His second suggestion shows how all minds are tending to realise the need of an 'An Agreed Constitution', *to be drafted as early as possible, by Indians themselves*. But compare his suggestion with that made in this book, (pp. 16, 247-248, *supra*).

The *National Herald*, 4-10-1941, reports that Khan Bahadur Alla Bux, Premier of Sind, put to Sir S. H. Khan, the question, "What to do if no such declaration was forthcoming?" ; and that Sir S.H. Khan's reply was that *then* "India should present a united front"! This is surely not a very brilliant and original suggestion. Did Sir S.H. Khan never see occasion for it before? Has not the Congress been not

presents itself, to enlarge upon the Government's *peace and war aims*... One member, Sir Stanley Reed, suggested to the Prime Minister to consider *definitely advising the Indian People*, of the British Commonwealth's *peace aims*, so that

only making the suggestion, but endeavouring, might and main, with much self-sacrifice, such as, perhaps Sir S.H. Khan never had occasion to make, (though some of his near relatives seem to have made), to bring about a "united front"? It is very unfortunate that the efforts of the Congress have not succeeded, so far, because of the lacks in its programme that have been pointed out. But let us welcome Sir S.H. Khan's suggestion, and suggest to him in return, that he should put his shoulder to the wheel, side by side with the Congress, *now*; since it is fairly certain that Mr. Churchill will not make any such fresh declaration as he wants. Sir S. H. Khan's suggestion is fresh proof of how even the most prominent Indian 'leaders' are really 'unprepared'. They do not know what exactly to aim at, what to work for, what to say and do when the need and the opportunity arise, what action to take; they can only utter useless phrases, or recommend useless activities, in an emergency, even a foreseen emergency. Mr. Alla Bux, in his press statement, strongly and cogently criticises Sir S. H. Khan's platitudes.

Incidentally, Mr. Jerome Boyer, of Fairlawn, New Jersey, U.S.A., asked Mr. Amery: "*Why does not Britain grant India Dominion Status now?*"; (*II. Times*, 2-10-1941). It is a very hopeful sign that the attention of the U.S.A. *public* has turned strongly to the need for justice to the Indian People. The Indian problem is arousing more and more wide interest in America; and pros and cons thereof are being discussed in many journals. Reuter, (*National Herald*, Lucknow, 6-10-1941), reports that "The American press has devoted more space in recent months to India and India's increasingly important role in the present gigantic war. While it is *generally critical* of *Britain's attitude towards India's political demands*, the newspapers also devote large space to Britain's difficulties in solving the Indian problem..." The *Chicago Times*, the *New York World Telegram*, the *New York Times*, the *New York Daily Mirror*, the *New York Sun*, the *New York Herald Tribune*, (?), the *Look*, *Harper's Magazine*, and the *Chicago Tribune*, are described by Reuter as publishing articles which discuss the Indian question, and all of which, with the doubtful

they might be under *no mis-apprehension* about the purpose for which they were being called on to fight. Mr. Churchill... said that he did not propose to add anything." The 'diplomacy' is hidden in, or, rather, brazenly looks out from, such phrases as 'the earliest *possible* moment' which is never allowed to become possible, and 'when a good opportunity *presents itself*' which is never allowed to present itself. But the story is the same, everywhere; though always, with a difference, too. In India, the Congress and the Communal Parties do not know what their own peace aims are, do not know their own minds; in Britain, the Ruling Group knows very well, but will not disclose them, until 'a good opportunity presents itself' of doing what they please and riding rough-shod overwhelmingly over every opponent, i.e., until the war has been won, and by them. It does not matter in the least, that grievous 'misapprehension' in the meanwhile, in every country, including Britain, is prolonging and spreading the War.

Mr. Churchill has written publicly, that he believes in striking down an enemy, and then helping him to get up, and treating him generously. Perhaps because India was never an enemy of Mr. Churchill or of Britain, therefore he believes in striking her down again and again, instead of helping her to get up and treating her generously. But it is much that he should have said what he said on 20-12-1940, implicitly acknowledging the *iniquity of the state of society* prevailing so far in Britain, most highly favored of fortune as

exception of one, express views favorable to India's demands.

The same issue of the *National Herald* reproduces an article from the *Bombay Chronicle*; which says that Mrs. Kamalā-dēvi Chattopādhyāya, who returned to India from U.S.A. in September, 1941, told a reporter of that paper one of her experiences, to the following effect: She was present at a lecture, in Chicago, by British Minister Mr. Duff Cooper. Questions were sent up asking him to substantiate his statements about India and M. Gandhi. Not one of these was taken up. Mrs. Kamalā-dēvi walked up to the platform, and spoke to the chairman and Mr. Duff Cooper. The latter began to exclaim: "You Asiatics... You Asiatics... What do you know about democracy? What have you known except tyranny and tyrants?".. Thereupon, Mr. Duff Cooper was assailed with shouts from the audience, of "What about India, Mr. Cooper? Why not free India?" Ultimately, police had to interfere.

that country has been up to this time. Even if he would confine that improvement to Britain, World conditions would not allow it to be kept thus confined, but would take it abroad, *if it is at all really good and sound*.

"I have always urged fighting wars and other contentions with might and main, *till* overwhelming victory, and *then* offering the hand of friendship to the vanquished"—thus wrote Mr. Churchill in his autobiographical book, *A Roving Commission*, (in which he claims also that he pleaded hard, but in vain, for treating Germany much more generously after the Great War, than was ultimately done by the Versailles Treaty). It might be all very fine, very romantic, very grand, sentiment; displaying the splendid chivalry of individual 'err-ant' knights, who had more love of 'glory' for themselves, than of that far-seeing 'wisdom' which seeks the general welfare of mankind. It was even very useful, very helpful, to oppressed individuals, in medieval times, for such knights "to ride abroad, redressing human wrongs". But it is all out of place, indeed very harmful, today, in the relations between nations; today, when war has become 'totalitarian' also, when whole populations are involved in the fighting, and civilians suffer more, in many ways, than the 'regulars' and professional soldiers. 'Overwhelming victories' too are usually Pyrrhic now, scarcely less bad than defeat. The invariable result, latterly, has been, in the mind of the victorious side, an uprush, not of magnanimity, but of the wish to squeeze, to blackmail, to press and oppress, the vanquished, to the utmost, and much more systematically and continuously than was possible in the earlier ages. The hand of friendship has been offered to the defeated very seldom, in the past, except in *Puranic* legends; more seldom is it the case now.

Reason, argument, *Sympathetic* Consultation and Conference, of the best and wisest, the most philanthropic and most experienced, representatives of *all* the parties concerned—is the only Remedy for the Dire Disease; *not* diplomatic double-dealings, double-crossings, Violence, War. "Man, proud man", exhibits his antics, and believes he can cheat God's Nature; but Nemesis comes unavoidably, from the most unexpected directions.

A British M.P.'s Views.

An article, by Mr. Aneurin Bevan, M. P., reproduced in the *National Herald* (Lucknow) d/- 22-1-1941, from the *Tribune*

(London), deserves record here in abridged form ; because it supports so excellently the plea of this book.

"I must confess to a feeling of profound disappointment. I had been led to hope that the Government were about to make a Declaration of War Aims. When I went to the House of Commons, on Tuesday last,...it seemed to me impossible for the Prime Minister to make another speech without giving some coherent *plan* and *intention* to the war effort of Britain. When he reached the end of his speech without even a *hint*... of War Aims, my heart sank. Quite apart from the overwhelming importance of the *right kind* of War Aims for the waging of victorious war, a *nation-wide discussion of our proposals* would be of the *greatest possible educative value*¹... War opens the most heavy-lidded eyes...It is at this moment, that the enlightened statesman should seize his chance to *make the people his eager collaborators* in the building of a New Social Order....What *criminal folly* it would be to *neglect this opportunity* !...The war has brought masses to an unprecedented political consciousness...They have been brought to see that the *vicissitudes* they suffer...are the *direct consequences of a particular kind of Social Organisation*, and, *therefore, capable of being dealt with by social action* ;... that *poverty, ill-health, economic insecurity, unemployment, and war, are socially preventible evils*....This century is pre-occupied by the relationship between men and various forms of *Social Organisation*.. The history of our times...will be seen as a sustained and often bloody effort *to bring the Organisation of Society under conscious control*. Even *Fascism* will be seen as a phase in the development of collectivism ; because, *on its best side*, it is an attempt to carve out a... piece of *Social Organisation* in which men can feel *secure*, even though it might be the security of a jail. Modern man is properly impatient of an *economic anarchy*, which assails him with a *multitude of evils*, and he will turn to anything which offers an escape...The *supreme test for democratic institutions is...a Planned Economy, which, at the same time, preserves decent personal liberties*.² ...This is the very *heart* of the modern *problem* ; and it must

¹This is exactly the reason why this writer has been crying for the putting forward of a tentative Scheme of Swaraj by the Congress.

²See Appendix C.

form the *centre* of any statement of *War Aims*, if they are to command the *support of the people*.

"...The area of *private property* must be *restricted*... Probably that is one of the reasons why the Cabinet are so reluctant to frame our War Aims. War Aims must take account of *International Planning*,...and it will not be possible for *Britain* to frame intelligent proposals for other countries unless she is prepared to so *adjust her own industries* that they can be fitted into the *International Pattern*. .. It will not be possible to prevail on the people of Britain to bear the agonies of continued warfare unless we are able to present them with a solution of their problems of a nature to command their affections....Many, *die-hard Tories*, pro-Fascists, and others, who, before the War, were deeply opposed to any radical change, *now see that we cannot go back to the old world*. What they want to be satisfied about is that it is possible to *reconcile Economic Planning with Individual Liberty*. Can the *State* be given power over our work, without the same power *swallowing the whole of our life*? This is the question millions are asking. *I believe it can be done.*"¹

¹See Appendix C. The following will show how, in Britain, the men in power think it *should* be done—by the State *taking* "power over our work" and "swallowing the whole of our life", even as in Germany, Italy, Russia.

Lord Halifax addressed the World Trade Dinner of the 28th National Foreign Trade Convention, in New York City, on 8-10-1941; (*Hindustan Times*, 9-10-1941). In the course of his speech he said: "The reconstruction of the shattered fabric of world trade must be planned and undertaken in co-operation by the United States and nations of the British Commonwealth, with the help, as we hope, of other free nations...In the short space of six weeks, there have been issued three documents which rank as historic beacons in the broad path of Economic Reconstruction,...(1) the Atlantic Charter, (2) the British Government's declaration in the Memo of 10-9-1941, regarding the use of Lease and Lend materials, (3) the Resolution adopted, on 29-9-1941, by Governments of the United Kingdom and Dominions together with the *free Governments of nine European countries* and by the U.S. S.R...They represent the challenge of the *American and British Co-operation* in the widest sense. With them we confront the challenge of Hitler's New Economic Order.

Indian Christians' Views.

In the same issue of the *National Herald*, an Indian Christian, Mr. G. S. Gideon, writes: "Recently, the British Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, in a farewell speech in honor of Lord Halifax, the newly appointed British ambassador to America, declared that the New World Order, for which the English-speaking nations are straining their nerves, would be based on Christian Ethics...Lord Halifax (is) the co-author of

Let no one think that in this war we are sacrificing everything. *We have to destroy one Dictatorship in order to establish Another of Our Own when the war is over.*" A message from Mr. Churchill said "I have no doubt that the deliberations would contribute to the establishment of a *Better Order*...for which the close co-operation of the *English-speaking* peoples will be so vital..."

"In an Order of the Day, issued to the German Army on the Eastern Front, Hitler states: "...Your names, Soldiers of the German Army, and the names of your *gallant allies*, will, for all time, be bound up with the greatest victory in the world...You have taken 2,400,000 prisoners, destroyed or captured 17,700 tanks, 21,600 guns, destroyed 14,200 planes... The world has never seen anything like it. The region that German and *allied* troops have occupied, is more than twice as large as the German Reich of 1933. From the north, where our brave *Finnish allies* for a second time have given evidence of their heroism, down to the Crimea, you, together with Slovak, Hungarian, Italian, and Rumanian divisions, stand 1000 kilometres deep in enemy territory. Spanish, Croat, and Belgian detachments are joining you, and others will follow you, for this fight is, perhaps for the first time, being seen by all nations of Europe as common action for the *Salvation of culturally the Most Valuable Continent*...With the help of God, you are bestowing on us not only victory, but also making the most important preparations for peace"; (*H. Times*, 11-10-1941). He does not state the German losses.

Each belligerent has been very loudly re-iterating, *ad nauseam*, that he is fighting for a Better Order, a Better World, a New Economic Order, World Reconstruction, Economic Reconstruction, the Salvation of Culture and Civilization, the preservation of the Freedom of Europe and also of the World. But in the above quoted two utterances, of Halifax and Hitler, respectively, the former, the 'tall thin

the Gandhi-Irwin pact, and one of the witnesses of the Munich agreement....But how does a Christian, who thinks himself to be an Indian by birth and heritage, look at the prospects of a *New Europe* to be built on Christian foundation? We in India are as anxious to gain our Independence as Frenchmen are for their own. *Will the so-called New Order be confined to the inhabitants of Europe only, or will it be extended to the peoples of Asia and Africa as well?*...The true message of Christ...the Europeans have consistently ignored all these centuries...The clue to future happiness lies *not* so much in the colossal *material sacrifice* which Britain, France, and America made in the last war and are making now; *but in a sacrifice on the moral plane, so that all the suppressed nations including India may realise that the war against Nazism is a war against every type of Imperialism.*¹...Mr. Churchill, when he speaks of Christian ethics, agrees with H.G. Wells that the world is *either in revolution or in collapse*; but if we wish to avoid destruction, *the revolution must be inspired by*

Christian' of Maulana Mohamed Ali, falls very short of the latter, in 'piety' as well as politics. He 'lets the cat out of the bag', and blurts out, plainly, what the 'Victory' means which, on a former occasion, (see p. 114, *supra*), he said, was the main War-aim of Britain; 'Victory' means the destroying of the German Dictatorship, and the establishing, in its place, of the British, or, at most, a British-American, Dictatorship. The rest of Lord Halifax's address, capped by Mr. Churchill's message, makes it clear that only the *English-speaking* peoples will have their thumb in the pie; not French-speaking, not Spanish or French or German or Italian speaking, not even the Russian speaking, and, of course, no Asiatic or African language speaking peoples will be permitted to even smell, much less touch, that pie. And Lord Halifax does not mention God at all; while Hitler, said to be the denier of God, does! Christian as he is reputed to be, Lord Halifax should himself realise, and should advise his chief, Mr. Churchill, that it is not the Dictatorship of *English-speaking*, or any other *language-speaking*, peoples, that will establish 'Peace on earth and good-will among men', but the *Co-operation of Right-thinking* men, and women, of *all lands* and *all languages*, that will do so.

¹See the Congress Working Committee's Statement, pp. 22-4, *supra*.

Religious forces...Respect for Human Personality is the corner-stone of Christian Ethics. How far exploitation of four hundred million Indians is based on such ethics, Lord Halifax must answer, and Americans must judge."

The *Hindustan Times*, d/- 24-1-1941, reports that "The Conference of Indian Christians, convened under the joint auspices of the Indian Christian Association, Madras, and the Indian Christian Federation of South India, under the presidentship of Mr. Sunderishan, welcomed the declaration that *Dominion Status* was the *Goal of India*, and called upon the Government to take the initiative ..by introducing some workable Constitution *immediately*, and by fixing a time-limit for the grant of the promised *Dominion Status* "

A Muslim M.L.A. (Central)'s View.

The same issue also reports that "a resolution tabled by Maulvi Abdul Rashid Chaudhuri, an unattached member, for discussion in the Budget Session (in Feb. 1941) of the Central Assembly, recommends that *India* should be declared as having *Dominion Status*, and asks that *immediate steps* be taken, *without waiting for the termination of the war*, to give *India* a *Constitution with full power to control its own soil*, so that *India* can co-operate freely with the Government of the United Kingdom and that of the other *Dominions*, without having to take its orders from a country and a Parliament six thousand miles away." It will be noticed that the resolution uses the language of the *Statesman* editorial, quoted at p. 37, *supra*.

The Indian Liberal Party's View.

The Indian Liberals, in their reply, (*vide Hindustan Times*, d/- 18-1-1941), to the letter of the nine M.P.'s discussed before (pp. 31-3, *supra*), also said, in more restrained and elaborate language, what others have said more freely and outspokenly. "We agree that the *controversy* with regard to *Dominion Status* and *Independence* has no practical importance,...but it can be put an end to, only by granting *Dominion Status* to *India*, and thus securing to her the reality of national freedom...(Various) Declarations on the part of Government...encourage communal intransigence...In a recent speech of Mr. Amery," (certain observations) "have, we are afraid, created the impression that *Britain* is taking advantage of the communal difficulties in order to maintain her power...How can *India*, which is not assured of her future freedom, forget its humiliating position, and work enthu-

siastically for the freedom of England and other nations? We are unreservedly opposed to the totalitarian systems,...but we deeply regret that the British Government have so far failed to unify British and Indian interests, and to inspire zeal for the British cause among the people of India...We believe in co-operation between Britain and India, if it could be achieved on honorable terms."

The Liberals might well have added: 'When even many of your fellow-M.P.'s and a very important and large section of the British People are not satisfied with the British Government's policy of silence as regards War and Peace Aims, and methods of dealing with the Indian problem, how can you expect that a simple letter from you, like this, will satisfy the Indian People?' It will be noted that the language of the above extract from the reply of the Liberals, so far as it goes, is not different from that of the Wardha Statement of 14-9-1939.

The Second Suggestion.

After all the preceding chapters, the second suggestion, already 'suggested' throughout the book, (the first was made specifically in chapter II, pp. 14-15, and was re-stated on p. 247), may now be put specifically.

Seeing that by the reported claims of the British rulers themselves, Britain has been hitting the "two gangsters" of Mr. D. Cooper, Germany and Italy, at least as hard as they have been hitting Britain, and probably (Italy certainly) harder; seeing also that *all* the belligerents have been proclaiming their wish to 'Re-construct the World', 'make a new and better World Order', 'a Better World', and to establish real 'Freedom' in every country of Europe at least; there appears more than sufficient reason, for some humanist, benevolent, world-known, and (in respect of the war) neutral lover of Humanity, (President Roosevelt and M. Stalin *were* best placed to do so, but are no longer), who feels that there has been more than enough destruction already, to proclaim this Suggestion to the world:

CALL TO ALL BELLIGERENTS.

All the *belligerents* together should call a Truce, announce an Armistice for a few weeks, and place *their respective Schemes of a 'Better World'* before the world, and before some such body as a very select and representative Committee of the League of Nations, (which has suspended itself for

the present); or a new Committee, Assembly, Conference, of *humanist Scientists*, chosen from all countries, the actively belligerent, as well as others, especially the 'colored' and 'exploited'; to extract from the several schemes, the Greatest Common Measure, make reasonable changes, and show to the belligerents that, (unless they are hypocrites and deceivers), they all, really, at heart, want the same sort of 'Better World', that their differences are those of only words and misunderstandings, (on the whole, after eliminating the perversions caused by personal and national ambitions and greeds); that it is *quite possible to satisfy the reasonable demands of all the peoples, whose general welfare, whose good, they all profess to seek*; and so make the Truce permanent, convert it into Peace, and save Humanity from further destruction.

Who knows but that, when the hearts' desires and heads' thoughts, of all, are displayed openly to all, on a common board, they *may* all realise with shame and amazement, that they have all been wishing and thinking the same things, and have been fighting under a great delusion, mistaking, in the darkness of ignorance and misunderstanding, the brother for a robber.

(a) Feeble as its voice will be amidst the roar of the tempest that is raging, still the Indian National Congress, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, now a world-recognised figure, may rightly proclaim to the world such a Call. It may be that the Churches will support it strongly. It may be that Providence may move the hearts of the belligerents to accept it. If they do, then the voice of the Call will lull to rest the voice of the tempest. The conflagration will be checked at once in Europe; also in China; and will not spread to the mid-East, as it is steadily and slowly doing.

(b) Besides making the above suggestion, Mah-

atma Gandhi may appoint a small Committee, as said above, to sketch out a Scheme of Swaraj, for India, which will make adequate provision for all the desiderata, nos. 1 to 6, enumerated by Pt. Jawaharlal in his article (see pp. 327-8, *supra*), and will secure, for all, "Social Welfare, including every thing, spiritual, cultural, political, economic, and social", (in his own words). It is very *probable* that such a Scheme, by its own inherent merits, its self-evident fairness and equitability, its 'equity', (if not any impossible 'equality' in all respects), its provision for the welfare of all, without difference of creed, color, caste, race, or sex, *will appeal to and be accepted by all sections of the People*, Hindu, Muslim, Christian, etc., and by all such leaders, whether Hindu or Muslim or Christian or any other, as may be free from megalomaniacal ambition and inordinate greed for power and insatiable craving to be 'first' and 'leader' and 'dominator' everywhere. Because Swa-raj has been interpreted, so far, by every one, in terms of mere '*Power*', *without specification of how that power will be used to ensure General Social Welfare*, it has inevitably created mutual distrust, mutual fear, mutual hate, between the several communities, sects, castes, professions, nations, races. Interpret it in terms of an honest, just, *Equitable*, specified *Use of Power*, and all the mischief, *all the Mutual Suspicion*, *will vanish* from the hearts and heads of all alike, and a '*Better World*' will begin now.

The papers reported that the President of the Muslim League, Mr. Jinnah, in the course of a public speech at Delhi on 1-12-1940, "asked what were the War-Aims of the Congress against the British Government; was Civil Disobedience launched really for the Freedom and Independence of India?; and said he was unable to accept this". If the Congress had placed before the public a Rational Scheme of Swaraj, which

would have patently shown the specific sort of 'ordered freedom' and 'qualified independence' i. e. equal *inter-dependence*, 'reciprocal freedom', which the Congress wanted, it would have been impossible for any one to say things like this. The misfortune is that the Muslim League and its President and leaders have done no better, in this respect, than the Congress and its leaders; nor have the Hindu Sabha and its leaders. They have all been saying they want Independence and Freedom; but none has made any attempt to specify the main uses to which it or he or she would put it, if and when achieved. If they had the wisdom to state, more specifically and publicly, what they wanted, they would, for very shame, if for no better reason, have been compelled to frame their schemes so as not to outrage the clear rights of any section of the People, and would all have been able to come to terms easily. In challenge and counter-challenge, leaders of the Muslim League and Hindu Maha Sabha have gone to the length of saying that they want 'Muslim Raj' and 'Hindu Raj' respectively—which makes rational reconciliation impossible. Such reconciliation of all is possible only in "Human Raj"; not in Hindu or Muslim or Christian Raj; not in British or German or Japanese or Russian Raj. It is possible in Aristo-Homo-cracy; not in Autocracy, Bureaucracy, Timocracy, Plutocracy, Theocracy, Hagiocracy, or a Democracy which is either Mobocracy and Anarchy or a Dictator's Autocracy. All these moonstruck political and communal leaders of India, like the rulers of Europe, can talk only in terms of the artificial 'labels', Indian, Hindu, Muslim, Shia, Sunni, Touchable, Untouchable, British, French, German, Italian, Greek, Aryan, Jew, and of the catchwords Freedom, Independence; they cannot talk in terms of 'Human Being' and the 'Common Needs' of all, Food, Clothes, Shelter, Family-life, Refined Recreation, Health, Education, Protection, Rights-and-Duties, Communion with Nature and Nature's Governing Mystery. Surely that Inscrutable Mystery has afflicted them with Madness and blinded their vision, in order that they may lead their followers and nations together with themselves into the torments of Avernus; from which they may rise again, after having expiated their Collective Ignorance and Sins of excessive Lusts and Greeds and Hates, to the Ways of Wisdom and Rational Living.

If these leaders and rulers would only see that those old labels, Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Jew, British, French, German, Russian, Italian, Aryan, Mongolian,

etc. are no longer a help, but a terrible hindrance, if they would only seek honestly, sincerely, without personal or national greeds and ambitions, or blind obstinacies, for the *Straight Path* prayed for in *all* the Scriptures, which alone *can* lead *all* to happiness, they would surely find it. The Sun of the Ancient Wisdom is flaming on it, illuminating it, all the time ; but they are shutting their eyes and turning their faces away from it.

Mahatma Gandhi and Pt. Jawaharlal and Maulana Azad and Shri Rajagopalachari and the other eminent and prominent Congress leaders are, all of them, believers (at least so they say) in Swa-dēshi. Unless they know of, or can discover, *something better*, let them, (in *addition* to—not *instead* of, not in *supersession* of—whatever else they have thought, or may in future think, fit to do), carefully study the *Principles* of the very Swadeshi, very ancient, and psychologically very Scientific, Individuo-Socialist Scheme of Organisation of Society. They will find that it is *wholly independent* of any and every particular *race or religion* ; deals with human beings as such, in terms of their natural needs, faculties, temperaments ; ensures a due balance of power, between all the natural sections or vocational classes of Society ; brings suitable work and appropriate worker together ; is, with necessary adjustments in details, as needed by modern changed conditions, as perfectly valid and applicable today as five thousand years ago, (in respect of *Principles*, because based on scientific psychological facts and laws) ; and ensures “social welfare, including every thing, spiritual, cultural, political, economic, and social”, to the utmost extent humanly possible.

The Law Member of the Viceroy's Council and Leader of the House in the Central Legislative Assembly, Sir M. Zafrulla Khan,¹ speaking at Jamshedpur, on 9-12-1940, said : “We

¹Now a Judge of the Federal Court of India, New Delhi, since October, 1941. On 26-5-1941, a talk by him was broadcast from Delhi, in the course of which he stated “Six principles for the foundation of a New World Order...
(1) Abolition of the system of interest-bearing loans,

must not only strive for victory on the field of battle...we must also strive for *a new heaven and a new earth*, where humanity will be able to find freedom, justice, and happiness". On 20-11-1940, Mr. Bhulabhai Desai,¹ Leader of the Congress Party and Leader of the Opposition in the same Central L. Assembly, (repeating a sentence from the Congress Working Committee's Stt. of 14-9-'39, see p. 23, *supra*), said in the House: "If the issue is...a World Order based on Democracy, then India is intensely interested in it". From the quotations made before, it is abundantly clear that the leaders and rulers of all the nations of east and west, today, are uttering the same words, "an ideal Swaraj", "a New World Order", "a Better World", "a Reconstruction of Human Society", "a New Heaven and a New Earth", *but none of them is stating the lines on which he thinks that this Better World can and should be constructed*, for the others to consider calmly and rationally. Instead, they are all fighting with one another, in India 'non-violently'; elsewhere, with horrible violence. If instead of endeavouring to crush each other's heads, metaphorically or literally, they would only put their heads together, in peaceful

(2) Discouragement of hoarding of money and capital, (3) Abolition of the law of primogeniture, (4) Discarding racial or national privilege or superiority, (5) Provision of minimum necessities of life for every citizen, (6) Establishment of a system of trade by barter"; (*II. Times*, 28-5-1941). It is much that a member of the Central Government of India, as he then was, should have had the conscience and the courage of conviction to broadcast such anti-capitalist views, despite the restrictions of office. But it is obvious that these 'six principles' are very insufficient, disjointed, un-co-ordinated; and need to be fitted into a Comprehensive Systematic Scheme of Social Organisation, properly, in order to become workable. It would be well if Sir M. Zafrullah Khan, now that he has very much more leisure in his new office, (the Judges of the *very expensive* Federal Court, which came into existence some five years ago, have had almost no work to do as such Judges), would give time and attention to the study of the whole problem of a World Order, and publish his own carefully thought out Scheme of it.

¹He was put in prison shortly after, but has been released, because of very serious illness, in the middle of September, 1941.

and sensible consultation, (a) they would prove to each other, and to all the world, that their words and promises are not hollow and deceitful, that they are sincere ; and by that very fact, (b) they would be enlightened and strengthened from within, for, and would most surely succeed in, actually creating a new heaven and a new earth, of peace on earth and good-will among men, and therefore of every prosperity for all Mankind. 'Let us achieve righteousness *and wisdom*, and all things else shall surely be added unto us.'

CHAPTER XI.

Some Supplementary Considerations re' Freedom and other things.

This book should end with the preceding chapter, except for the Appendices often referred to. But some notes on the subject of Freedom and cognate matters have remained unused. It seems desirable to gather them in a supplementary chapter.

The word 'Freedom' may well be dwelt upon a little more. It is worth while ; nay, necessary. For this noble word, with its equivalents, 'Liberty' and 'Independence', has, like so many other good words, fallen on evil days, lost its proper significance, and become a most mischievous catchword, in thoughtless, hasty, or evil-designing, heads and mouths.¹

The perversion has been caused by excess of the instinct of Egoism ; which has overpowered its twin-instinct of Altruism. Yet the living and working of both, in harmony, by Reasonable Division of Labor, of time-place-circumstance, is necessary for the Orderly Progress of Man in the World-Process. Egoism is the basis of Individualism ; Altruism, of Socialism. Neither must be allowed to overwhelm and abolish the other. For, then, both will perish. Love creates ; Hate destroys ; Reason balances, adjusts, makes the needed allocation of time-place-condition, guides, preserves, carries on. The two instincts, like fire and water, provide the steam-power of Life ; Reason supplies the rails, engine, cars, driver, guard, telegraph and phone, and all the rest of the multifarious paraphernalia necessary, to carry passengers and goods safely to their desired goals.

Individualist-Nationalist-Imperialism, in the so called 'Democratic' countries, has given rise to its copy and, at the same time, deadly rival, Imperialist-Fascist-Nazism or National Socialism, in so-called (Individualistically) 'Dictatorial' countries. 'Two of a trade cannot agree'. Two lovers of the same

¹The fate of the Samskr̥t equivalents of Freedom, etc., Moksha or Mukti, Swa-tantra-tā, Sw-ādhīna-tā, (strictly, Self-dependence), has been similar, in a different way. The old, old, story : 'Good customs, by excess, corrupt themselves'.

'beloved', World-Dominion, are bound to be mortal enemies. Individualist-Capitalist-Imperialism, again in the 'Democratic' countries, has, by reaction, given rise to its opposite and mortal enemy, Communist-Socialist-Bolshevism, openly in one country and incipiently and underground, in other countries, which too has become (Individualistically) 'Dictatorial-Autocratic-State-Socialist-Nationalist, by force of 'surroundings'.

It is the duty of the Collective Reason of the best and wisest Representatives of All Nations, to correct all such perversions as these; which have all been brought upon Freedom by Excess of Egoism, by Extremism. It is the duty of such Collective Reason to show the Right Way to *subordinate* Egoistic Freedom to Altruistic Freedom; and thereby reconcile and synthesise Individualism, (whether Imperialist or Capitalist or Militarist or Nationalist, or Autocratist or Bureaucratist or Hagiocratist, Timocratist, Plutocratist, Democratist, or any other), and Socialism (whether Guild, or State, or Syndicalist, or Communist, or any other). The only irreconcilable 'ism' is Extrem-ism.

Rational Socialism means, 'Freedom for each, in harmony with, without harm to, the similar freedom of every other'; driven to extremes and made ir-rational, it has come to mean, '*No* Individual freedom, *only* the State', as if the State were something wholly apart from individuals, a separate entity in and by itself. Rational Individualism means, 'Freedom for every Individual, in consonance with the similar freedom of every other Individual'; ir-rationalised by extremism, it insists, 'Freedom for *me*, for *my* individuality *only*, to do as I please; *not* for others, *not* for all'; or, when the Nation or State becomes an expanded Individuality (focussed in a single human individual, who becomes the *ipso facto* Dictator, whether the nation call itself monarchist, or republican, or oligarchic, or otherwise), then 'Freedom for Britain, or for Germany, or Italy, or France, or Holland, or Belgium, or Portugal, or America, or Japan, to do as that nation (i.e. its autocrat and bureaucrats) may please, with other nations' lands, goods, labor, limbs, and lives; *not* for India, China, and other Asiatic and African countries. Thus do 'Extremes meet' in disaster to Humanity; and, in action and result, the so-numbered *three* Ideologies, regnant in the Modern World, become difficult to distinguish; each culminates in a Dictator, and all in internecine War; with immense loss to each; and Freedom to none; not even to the Imperialist autocrats.

The slave owners come, in the end, to be no better off than the slaves. The jailors are no happier than the prisoners. Byron has written well,

“...The Nations are
In prison ; but the Jailor, what is he ?
No less a victim to the bolt and bar.
Is the poor privilege to turn the key
Upon the captive, Freedom ? He's as far
From the enjoyment of the earth and air,
Who watches o'er the chain, as those who wear.”

The Law of Action and Reaction necessitates that Sin recoil upon the Sinner. ‘Dictators’ and oppressive ‘rulers’ go in perpetual fear for their lives ; are constantly surrounded by hordes of spies and guards ; yet amongst these themselves, quite often, ‘terrorist’ and ‘nihilist’ assassins hide. They have to resort to bloody ‘purges’, wholesale political executions, massacres, and all the other well-known methods of repression. ‘Governments’ often say, ‘Our policy is dual, reform with one hand, repression of sedition with the other’. When the reform is sincere, the ‘governed’ are satisfied, and have no cause for sedition left. But where it is not sincere, not real, but only pretended and ‘diplomatic’, then the ‘governed’ too find themselves compelled to resort to a correspondingly dual policy, outward ‘submission’ with one hand, and ‘secret terrorist activity’ with the other ; or, where the people are sufficiently united and strong, then an ultimatum with one hand, and open rebellion and civil war with the other.

Even in ‘democratic’ States, especially in war-time and time of great unrest, President, Premier, Viceroy, is a complete ‘dictator’ in all respects.

All this happens only because the real meaning, the true nature, of Freedom is not correctly and widely taught and realised ; and, consequently, Egoism is not generally subordinated to Altruism ; Good-Swa-raj-mindedness, civic sense, sense of responsibility, of good citizenship, of duty, is not developed on the firm foundations of Reason, on the nation-wide and world-wide scale. Mankind has been, and is, slowly learning it, age after age, epoch after epoch, civilisation after civilisation ; with terrible travail and torment ; in ever new ways ; along new lines, in new forms, of experience, of individual and collective living.¹ ‘Pain’,

¹Winwood Reade's *The Martyrdom of Man*, finely describes, in very condensed form, this Progress of Man by

alas!, is the great stimulator of Intelligence, of Reason. 'No pains, no gains'. The wick and the oil in the lamp must *burn*, before they will give forth light. The living tree must be cut down and die before it will provide fuel to give warmth and cook food, and be fashioned into beams to support roofs, and furniture to give comfort. If there were no maladies, there would be no search for remedies, no sciences of physiology, anatomy, chemistry, physics, no systems of medicine. If there were no dangers and no war, there would not be tremendous impetus to, and no actual, astonishing discoveries and inventions. But this does *not* mean that maladies *are* health, that pains *are* gains, that war *is desirable*, that evil *is good*. "Knowledge increaseth Sorrow", says the Bible, through the mouth of Solomon;¹ but equally true is it that 'Sorrow increaseth Knowledge' and bringeth Wisdom, which is more than Knowledge, and which helps to resist sorrow; for it is Knowledge, especially of the human heart, *plus* Sympathy, Compassion, Philanthropy.

As 'Freedom' has been degraded into meaning 'freedom for the selfish and baser nature of man, and not for the unselfish and finer nature, to do as it thinks fit'; so have other words. 'Self-government' and 'auto-cracy' mean exactly the same, etymologically. Because 'auto-cracy' is now used for expressing a bad meaning, therefore the word 'auto-nomy' has been invented to distinguish the good meaning of 'Self-

Martyrdom. It is a great book, a noble precursor of Wells' *Outline of History*, but greatly unsatisfactory also, in its conclusions. It misses the peak of the all-synthesising Vedantic Truth, by just a narrow but deep chasm.

¹The *Yoga-Sūtra* and *Bhāshya* say the same: *Duḥkham ēva sarvaṃ, vivēkināḥ*; but with a significance which the words of the English rendering of the Bible text do not bring out. They mean that "The person who has learnt to discriminate between the Fleeting and the Eternal, who has become wise, has exhausted all worldly experience, is surfeited, world-weary, turned from the Path of Pursuit to the Path of Renunciation—such wise person sees and feels less keenly the 'gains', and much more acutely the 'pains' which are inseparable from all such 'gains', in the world of the transient things of sense, which pass and leave only sadness, sorrow, physical and mental agony, behind; 'all is vanity, vanity of vanities', Māyā, Pass-time, ultimately."

government' from the bad meaning. In 'Self-government', the good and the bad meaning, the nobler 'autos' and the baser 'autos', are confused most mischievously. The same confusion and perversion is reappearing in 'auto-nomy'; because the *dual* nature of the *autos*, the Self-self, is not duly recognised. In India, if the Governor of a province is invested with power to exercise his "individual judgment" absolutely, in respect of any matters, that province is called 'auto-nomous'. The etymological identity of, and the conventional, wrong, and mischievous distinction between, 'common-wealth' and 'communism' has been mentioned before.

'Freedom from Foreign Domination'.

The view, of some worthy Indian public workers, has been referred to before, (pp. 51-52), that 'freedom' means 'freedom from foreign domination'. This has, no doubt, some truth in it; but only *some*, only very partial, truth, at best. The instinct behind the view is that the kinsman, the clansman, the tribesman, the fellow-countryman, who understands my language, and whose language I understand, will be just and kind to me. But the instinct is often falsified; the hope founded on it grievously thwarted only too often. An Indian proverb says that 'there is no friend like the brother; but also no more bitter enemy', when the fraternal affection has been turned into hate by some cause, greed, scorn, insult, injustice, envy. "Heaven has no rage like love to hatred turned, nor hell a fury like a woman (or brother) scorned". Witness the Civil War in the U.S.A., of North against South; and the recent one in Spain. The current war between Britain and Germany is also 'fratricidal'. The kings and queens of Britain have, for many generations, now, been of German ancestry; as formerly they were of Danish, French, Scotch, Dutch. History is only too full of instances in which weak or vicious kings and kingdoms have been betrayed and murdered by vengeful or ambitious 'power-and-luxury-craving' relatives or ministers; and 'foreigners' called in by 'natives' suffering from the tyranny, of 'native' kings and governments, or from violent internal dissensions of other kinds, religious etc.¹ The case of India herself is very

¹In ch. 20, sec. 3, of *Outline of History*, (edn. of 1937, p. 291) dealing with 'Monarchy, Aristocracy, (Oligarchy), and Democracy in Greece', Wells writes: "In the oligarchic states, very often, the *excluded class* got over its dislike of *foreigners*

much in point. When, by reaction, in course of time, the 'foreign' rule becomes too oppressive, then the people necessarily seek to re-establish 'native' rule. Nature's law, of perpetual swing between two opposite extremes, operates here, as in all departments and aspects of Life. As the Hindi proverb says, 'Tired of the town, man runs to the forest; tired of the forest, he runs to the town'. On the largest scales, 'birth, death, re-birth', enact the same Cyclic Law, which governs atomic viruses and microbes as well as the vastest star-galaxies.

For our human 'practical' purposes of the present, we see that whatever value the distinction between 'foreigner' and 'native' may have had in past times; today, the abolition of boundaries by science has made a radical re-interpretation of the words 'country', 'foreign', 'native', 'nation', 'race', etc., necessary. Mankind advances mentally from smaller concept, outlook, sympathy, fellow-feeling, solidarity, to larger and larger; socially, politically, economically, from smaller to large and larger integration; till the New World Order of World Federation and World Organisation shall be reached. We have all to become 'Citizens of the World'. The real 'foreigner' 'stranger', 'foe', is the 'Baser Nature' within ourselves, in each one of us; the real 'native', 'fellow-countryman', 'compatriot', 'friend', 'helper', is the 'Higher Nature'.

The Indian States.

The people of the Indian States are free from 'foreign' rule, technically and formally. The rulers are Swa-dēshī, Indians. But they are *auto-cratic* ('self-governing'!) rulers; wholly 'irresponsible' to their *sub-jects*. In a large number of cases, they are utterly regardless of the welfare of their people; are regardful only to oppress them in various ways and squeeze money out of them to the utmost possible; to waste enormous quantities of that money in the fashionable resorts of Europe (including Britain), in showy, vicious, luxurious, sensational living, and dissipations of all sorts, aping the worst specimens of the 'aristocracy' and the 'millionaires' of those towns. They are, in short, sunk in the pleasures of the 'senses' and of

in its greater dislike of *the class at home* which oppressed it...The Greek exile resembled the French or Russian *émigré*, in being ready to treat his beloved country pretty roughly, in order to save her from the devils in human form who had taken possession of her and turned *him* out."

'sports', often sinful, even criminal.¹ In very flagrant instances, in which other causes are also mixed up with their internal maladministration and personal depravities, they are *deposed* by the 'paramount power', the British Govt. of India, to which alone they are utterly and very humbly responsible; and a minor is put upon the 'gaddi', (no longer possible to call 'throne'), with a regency council, of which a British officer is usually the head. Recent instances are those of Indore, Alwar, Nabha. The 'sub-jects' of 'Indian India' are often much worse off than the 'sub-jects' of 'British India'; discontent among them is stronger against the rulers; and repression of them more ruthlessly brutal; they are more literally 'sub-jects', 'thrown under' 'trampled upon', the *very reverse* of free; though possessed of 'Swa-rāj'.

The *Hindustan Times*, 19-3-1941, reports: "An ex-Dewan of an important State, while discussing the address of his Excellency the Viceroy to the Chamber of Princes during the week-end at New Delhi, made a sad commentary about the hollowness of such 'sham demonstrations', wherein the Viceroy speaks in terms of advancement in the States, pretending to forget very conveniently that the 'autocrats' forming his audience are these days engaged in retarding whatever nominal advancement or progress had been forced upon them by circumstances within the last decade; this 'make-believe' show cannot mislead any Indian, much less the subjects of the States. He pointed out the reactionary policies at present pursued by the Chancellor himself and his brother Princes, of which the Viceroy or the Political Department cannot plead ignorance. Gag on civil liberties and novel methods of repression, now existing in the States, cannot be hidden by such propaganda. The acid test of the Viceroy would only be the results, which the people could see for themselves, in the shape of undelayed introduction of liberal administration in the States. But for so doing, the Viceroy will have to educate his Agents, who in practice tender 'advice' to the Rulers. This does not seem to be either a probability for the near future, or the contemplated policy, was the final summing up given by this ex-Dewan".

Such a statement, by an *ex-Dewan*, whose conscience and tongue have been set free, from the salary-and-power-interests

¹See K. L. Gauba, *The Pathology of Princes*, and *Uncle S(h)am*.

and appertenant fears that tied them while he was in office, has the great value of a confession of personal experience.

How both 'Native' and 'Foreigner' may merge into 'Fellow-Human'.

What is needed now, for our practical purposes, is the encouragement and promotion of *psychologically* and *physiologically eu-genic* inter-national, inter-racial, inter-provincial, (for Hindus in particular) inter-caste, and inter-religious marriages.¹ Such would create vital biological bonds and natural alliances; and would provide a nucleus of the finest kind of amalgam, which would synthesise and hold together all the countries, nations, races, provinces, castes, religions; would gradually make the word 'foreigner' obsolete; would subordinate nationalisms, racialisms, provincialisms, caste-isms, creedisms, to Humanism; would replace the word 'freedom' by 'lawfully regulated freedom'; 'independence' by 'equal inter-dependence'; 'liberty' by 'ordered liberty'.

'Freedom'—in Western Self-governing Countries?

Early in 1939, a famous Congress orator, in the course of a public speech¹ in Benares, repeatedly used the word 'Freedom' with great effect, and was loudly clapped at each utterance of it. Questions were invited at the end. A few questions were put and were answered; none about 'Freedom'. The present writer, though he had been put into the chair, requested and received the lecturer's permission, and asked: "By Freedom, do you mean the kind that Britain has got?" The answer was, "No, Britain's masses are serfs of the Capitalists". "Then France?" "No; France is governed by cliques?" "Germany, perhaps?" "No, indeed; it is slave to a Dictator". "Then Russia surely, the cynosure of all those who long for something new, and better than the old?" "No, again; Russia too is under the heel of a Dictator". "Shall we say

¹Inter-religious marriages have examples in Japan. Marshal Nogi, famous in the Russo-Japanese War (1904-5), was a Shintoist, his wife a Buddhist, his son a Christian. They all lived together happily in the same house, each following his and her own ways of worship. This writer introduced a 'Bill for the Validation of Hindu Intercaste Marriages', in the Central Legislative Assembly, in 1936. It was killed prematurely, at the first reading, in 1937, by the indifference, and the absence (for another reason) of the whole of the Congress Party from the Assembly, on that date.

Italy?" "Bah!, with Mussolini as autocrat!" "Then surely we should have the Japanese variety, should we not; they are an Eastern people, like the Indians?" "By no means, again; do you not see that they are led by the nose by imperialist-militarist cliques, which want Asia-dominion at least, since they cannot yet entertain any hopes of World-dominion?" "But does not each one of these countries call itself 'independent', 'free from foreign domination', 'self-governing', full of 'Swa-raj'?" "But, in fact, some are ruled by single despots; others by oligarchic cliques and coteries; the masses are not free anywhere."¹ "But are not the despots and the cliques acquiesced in, tacitly or even explicitly supported, and even elected, by the masses who are their own countrymen? Would you not have the same arrangement in India? If not, then will you please tell us what exactly is the sort of Freedom you want for India? Will you kindly define it? Will you say what meaning you precisely attach to the word? Also, *how* you propose to *achieve*, and then *maintain*, that real, true, genuine Freedom for India?" The answer, with a smile, was, "Oh! everybody knows what Freedom means, and the way the Congress is following, is the way to achieve it." The questions had to come to an end.

What this writer 'knows' is that, if not everybody, at least many a body, either 'knows' that 'Freedom means that *I* should be free to do as *I* please with other people and their belongings,' or is satisfied with shouting the word without caring to understand its exact meaning. The vagueness and confusion of thought on the subject is very widespread and very dangerous.

The orator above mentioned, though hopelessly hazy as to the nature of genuine Freedom, and as to the way of securing it, was, however, very right in denying it to the countries mentioned.

The Condition of Freedom in the West.

J. S. Mill published his famous classic, *On Liberty*, in 1859. He restated freshly, "the grounds, *both practical and philosophical*, on which...liberty of thought, and the cognate liberty of speaking and writing, discussion, association, meeting, and liberty of the press.....rest." He did so, because the grounds "are perhaps *not so familiar to the general*

¹One is reminded of the English rhyme: "The Rat, the Cat, and Lovell our Dog, Rule all England under the Hog".

mind, nor so thoroughly appreciated by many *even* of the *leaders* of opinion, as might have been expected." If this was the case in Britain eight decades ago, it is so today, very greatly, in India. At the close of the introductory chapter, Mill hopes that he will be excused, "if, on a subject which, for now three centuries, has been so often discussed, I venture on one discussion more".

The apology was scarcely needed. The task of world-mending is unending. The dust will gather every day; and has to be swept away every morning. Excretion and secretion, night and day, evil and good, war and peace, hate and love, error and truth, (both 'relative', in every sense), are always alternating. "Some must laugh and some must weep"; some spread dust, and some must sweep; some will sow, and some will reap. Those in whose heart, the Light of Wisdom has arisen, out of the burning of the oil of Sympathy and the wick of Knowledge by the fire of vast Human Sorrow and Suffering; they cannot consciously and deliberately be on the side of Selfish Evil. They must work, to the best of their powers, feeble or strong, such as have been vouchsafed to them, on the side of Un-selfish Good, of Justice, Equity, and Good Conscience. The word Conscience, etymologically and truly means 'Common-Science', 'Common-Sense', 'Knowledge, opinion, view. held in common, by a great many people, and regarded as promotive of the Common Good'. Those who have such Conscience, have to periodically re-examine and re-discover the true nature of Liberty, Freedom; re-state its case to the world; and struggle as they can, to secure it; with particular reference to the *new conditions* of Life and Society that arise with change of circumstances, and take distinctive shape.

The Relativity of Truth.

To show how 'relative' even an obvious truth may be, an instance may be given in passing. 'Tugs-of-war'; competition in games and sports; trophies for the victorious individual or team; incentives to children, 'if you eat what I am giving you, you will grow stronger than that neighbour-boy who is now stronger than and bullies you'; are *deliberately* encouraged and arranged by even benevolent and wise educationists and parents. They have the same spirit behind them that real aggressive evil war has. Yet they are helpful, nay necessary, for the *growth* of the *young*; but always *within limits*. Because this playful stimulation of the competitive spirit has

been carried *beyond due limits*, in homes and educational institutions, in the west, and in those eastern countries which copy that west now, therefore we have these real and ferocious wars, and more or less painful conflict in *all* departments of human life. To the Un-conscious or Supra-conscious Universal Mind of Nature's God; that Universal Mind which *is* God's Nature; even this real and dire Conflict is like the 'tug-of-war' of school-boys; and those highly advanced souls, which are in *conscious* touch with that Supra-conscious Mind, *may*, in special circumstances, have to promote, consciously and deliberately, (as the *Mahā-bhārata* says, Kṛṣṇa did), even the Evil of Aggressive (and therefore, simultaneously, on the other side, the Good of Defensive) War, for the general advancement of Mankind to a New and higher Civilisation. 'Out of Evil cometh Good'; though Evil remains evil; and Good, good. In national scriptural legends, the arch-angel Azaz-iel (of the Hebrew conception, not the Satan of the Christian conception), is such a *deliberate* Tempter and Tester,¹ (who rejoices when his temptations are withstood), by the command of God himself; so is the *dēva-r̥ṣhi* Nārada a deliberate promoter of war, in the Indian *Purāṇa*-legends.

Repression of Freedom by the Great Powers.

Of the few recent books on the subject of Liberty or Freedom, in English, that this writer has had the opportunity of looking into, two have struck him as possessed of outstanding merit, viz., *Liberty in the Modern State*, by H. Laski, and *Liberty Today*, by C. E. M. Joad. They have been already referred to before, repeatedly, and quoted from. They bring together impartially, much reliable information from past as well as recent and current history, and set forth the arguments, pro and con, excellently; though, published in 1938, when war was imminent, or indeed had become certain, they speak in a lower key of the shortcomings of Britain. They have the scholar's merit of trying to be accurate in the statement of facts, ('trying', because 'professional and professional scholars' also often differ as to facts even, and much more as to inferences), without the scholar's frequently narrow-minded expertism; and they studiously endeavour to arrive at balanced views, avoiding under-statements as well as over-statements. They treat the subject, not academically, but

¹Marie Corelli, in her novel, *The Sorrows of Satan*, tried to work out this idea.

very livingly, illustrating their views vividly with facts of current history of the most acute interest; and they may be said to have re-written Mill's work much more fully and brought it up to date.¹ *But*—there is a 'but'—the *conclusions* the two arrive at, which are much the same, fail to say definitely *what specific action*, mankind and its leaders *should take*, for the securing to all, of the Freedom-Liberty they advocate. The conclusions are more or less negative; somewhat like 'pious wishes' only. Some abridged extracts, with comments interspersed, will help to illustrate.

Joad's book, *Liberty Today*, is divided into two parts, (A) The Attack (on Liberty) and (B) The Defence (of Liberty). Each is sub-divided into three chapters; A (I) The Twilight of Liberty, (II) The Factors Hostile to Liberty, (III) The Case against Liberty; and B (I) The Case for Liberty, (II) The Alternative to Liberty, (III) The Prospects for Liberty.

"In the democracies of the West, the nineteenth century witnessed the triumph of men's efforts to establish the principles of free discussion, free speech, and free writing. Liberty of teaching and liberty of the Press were everywhere conceded in principle, and by no means always denied in practice; religious intolerance was on the wane; the public mind was increasingly imbued by scientific standards of impartiality and scientific respect for evidence." Scarcely a dozen years passed after the close of that century, when dark clouds filled the skies in place of the sunshine. The Great War began. "Today, (1938, when the book was published), Over most of the so-called civilised world, *liberty of thought does not exist*. Government is omnipotent and strictly irresponsible; the press is its mouthpiece; education, its propaganda; history, its apologist; the arts, its echo. As

¹These two books have the further great merit of being comparatively small in extent, brightly written, very readable, and 'popular', truly 'democratic', in price. Laski's book appears in the *Pelican Series*, at sixpence; and Joad's, in the *Thinker's Library*, clothette-bound, at one shilling; both excellently printed, in good clear type, and got up in a very hardy and pleasing format. They should have a very wide circulation, in India, and may, with advantage, be studied by all political workers who have not the opportunity to study the subject in larger and more expensive, and probably less useful, books.

for Democracy, the only form of government that has been able to tolerate liberty in the past, after fighting and winning a war for its ideals in 1914, it is fighting today for its existence. ...Men are at present living under Dictatorships, open or disguised, in Germany, Italy, Austria, Hungary, Turkey, Poland, Yugo-Slavia, Rumania, Greece, and Russia. In Russia the dictatorship is of a different type, and exists avowedly for the achievement of *valuable ends*..It might achieve some part of these ends...If so, ..then the strictures to which this, in common with every other form of dictatorship, is exposed, (will) lose much of their force. In spite, however, of the new Constitution, (1936) 1937, there has not been any substantial increase in *personal freedom*...The Russian State, far from 'withering away', ..has become the *most omni-competent bureaucracy* in the world...Russia, no doubt, is the scene of a great experiment, whose outcome, I am the last to prejudge; ...but it is difficult to restrain impatience when Trotsky's great *History of the Russian Revolution* is banned."¹ In Ireland, Bulgaria, Japan, India, there is a strict

¹An article by B. D. Wolfe, condensed from *Harper's Magazine*, in *Reader's Digest* (New York), for July, 1941, under the title *The Silent Soviet Revolution*, if it is to be believed, shows that "The New Order...in the Soviet Union has little in common with the Socialism envisaged by the founders of the Socialist movement"; in short, Russia has gone back to Czarism of a more comprehensive, systematic, inexorable kind; only under new names; and there is as complete regimentation of the whole population as in Nazi Germany. The article is difficult to disbelieve; it quotes *Ukases* with dates. Seven-hour day and six-day week were changed by *Ukase* of the Presidium to eight-hour day and seven-day week; (*Pravda*, 27-6-1940); without any increase of wages. Article 5 of the decree punishes desertion from work with "*forced penal labor* at the place of employment, and loss of 25 p.c. of wage". "Labor shortage", "huge labor armies conscripted and worn out", "concentration camps for forced labor", "unexpected decline in birth rate", "divorce made difficult", "marriage tie glorified", "abortion made a penal offence", etc., are mentioned. "*Free, universal, education, guaranteed by the Constitution of 1936, was abolished on 3-10-1940*...It is the pinnacle of a long mounting trend toward the creation of a *new privileged caste* in the Soviet

censorship of speech and writing : also in Canada, U.S.A., and, to a lesser extent, Britain "Dictatorships equate disagreement with sin ; they are incommoded by truth...In a single recent

Union. Only the children of well-paid officials, technicians, artists, writers, can aspire to the training which will create the next generation of such" ; for they only have *high salaries* and *incomes*, and can pay the *high fees* now imposed, for education ; "on the other hand...millions of the sons of working men will, thereby, be forced into the factories, and at an earlier age...Thus is *equality of opportunity abolished* by a *single stroke* of the *pen* This is the heart of what is happening in Russia, the total militarisation of daily life and labor...The authorities have eliminated the last vestiges of democracy from the Red Army. On 8-5-1940, Czarist military titles replaced the simple 'commander'. On 23-6-1940, an order made mandatory the saluting of an officer off duty, and officers were informed that 'playing up' to the Red Army Masses, and efforts to show democratic feelings, are offences against the service regulations...The climax came on 12-10-1940. New regulations gave officers the right, in cases of insubordination, to apply all measures of coercion, including force and firearms, without court-martial and without responsibility for resulting injury or death The Soviet Union is increasingly turned into one vast military encampment" ; like Germany ; like Japan ; like Britain too, now, though with much less compulsion and much more impulsion. One may say this of Britain, with its legislation placing all private property and all labor at the disposal of the Government, during the war ; but the Acts of legislation are being worked in a mild, and more decorous, form, with more discreet exercise of the absolute power, with much less compulsion and much more impulsion and concession to Labor.

It *may* be said that this silent *re-revolution* back to militarist Czarist autocracy and bureaucracy in Russia, is the direct consequence of the hostility of the other Great Powers ; and that things will go back to Socialism after the War. But this is *not* wholly convincing. There are *inherent* conflict-causing *psychological defects* in the variety of Socialism that Lenin propounded, and himself failed to work out ; as in the ideologies of the Great Powers. And a *return* to that sort of Socialism will need another *bloody revolution* to correct it.

year, there were fifty thousand arrests, for political reasons, in India alone...In March, 1938, there are nearly fifty thousand men, perhaps one hundred thousand, interned in concentration camps, in Germany, because of opinions they hold, or of their race; in these camps, brutalities, which recall the Middle Ages are, if report can be believed, of daily occurrence..."; (pp. 4-10).

"What of the still surviving democracies of France, America, England? The disease is still in infancy here, but symptoms are not wanting of its approach. The imprisonment of Tom Mooney and the trial of Sacco and Vanzetti in America, the imprisonment of Tom Mann in England, the sentences imposed upon the Meerut prisoners in India—sufficiently testify...The Sedition Bill, 1934, (England) shows the direction of the wind..."; (pp. 16-18) "*Men and women are truly free only when their bodies are free from want, and their minds from external domination. Only an economically prosperous community, endowed by a rational system of distribution, and by a rational system of education, can be regarded as a free community*"; (pp. 25-26).

Mr. Joad does not tell us, except once, indirectly and passingly (p. 92), that the *restraint of over-population*, the *balancing* of population and of production and distribution of consumable goods, is *indispensable* for economic prosperity; nor does he say what he regards as the *fundamentals* of *rational distribution*, and of the *vocational aspect of rational education*.

He goes on to describe "the Mood of Contemporary Youth...Gone are the cynicism, the disillusionment, the flippancy of the post-war years. The student of today goes into a world which appears to have no need of his services...*Politically*, (economically), and *spiritually guideless*, the contemporary young are dry tinder to flare to the spark of whatever generous enthusiasm can catch them. It is a serious-minded generation, anxious for *Principles* and a *Creed*;" (pp. 26-38). 'Educated' Un-employment is far worse in India.

Ch. II of Pt. A deals with "the Factors Hostile to Liberty": "(1) the Circumstances militating against Democratic Government, such as (a) blindness of economic action; (b) growth of centralisation; (c) atmosphere of crisis; (d) clumsiness of Parliamentary Machine...largely superseded, in times of crisis, by the method of Orders in Council; (e) evils of the Party System;" (pp. 36-46).

(2) "Circumstances militating against the Freedom of the Individual Citizen; such as (a) generation of the Mass Mind by (propagandist and unnatural) Education; (b) generation of the Mass Mind in Employment...so that men will develop into efficient automata without initiative or creative ability,... mere cogs in the social mechanism; (c) generation of the Mass Mind in Leisure...(so that) to step on foot-throttles, insert coins into metal slots, scan head-lines, crowd through clicking turnstiles, rush head-long through the air or over the earth (and water) in mechanisms propelled by petrol, constitute the modern notion of leisure-using,...all creation-saving, energy-economising, thought-inhibiting¹; all rapidly leading; to an intolerable boredom," which can be ended only by individual suicide or international homicide; (46-52). Then, under (2-d), "Effects of Science on the Community" are dealt with, such as "growth in the size of the State, growth in its complexity, increase in the facilities for transport which have made the world economically one, and in the facilities for communication between mind and mind which have made possible a new *domination of minds by minds*...by means of the press, the cinema, the gramophone, the radio; whereby Governments enjoy unprecedented power over the *minds* of their citizens... *There can be democracy, only where citizens are individuals... not robots*...A completely mechanised society would be a servile State in which all *spiritual and intellectual life* would be *strangled*...The bee-hive or the ants' nest is the type." Finally, (2-e) deals with "Effects of the *Decline of Religion*... Most men have a *need to believe*; and, deprived of a God in heaven," and (unable yet to find the Omni-present God, the Universal Self, *within* themselves as well as *without*, in *everything*), "they tend unconsciously to look for one on earth; and they find him in a political leader who fulfils the double purpose of providing an object to worship, and of enabling them to forego the *disagreeable process of political thinking*...Lenin, for example, or Hitler, tends to become invested

¹Incidentally, this seems to be rather inconsistent with Joad's observations re 'the mood of contemporary youth' quoted above, and the further observations, to be quoted presently, re 'the craving of men to *believe*.' The reconciling explanation would probably be that the two sets of statements refer to two types of minds, or to two classes of persons in different economic and other circumstances.

with divine attributes"; (pp. 52-58). In India, Mahatma Gandhi tends to be so invested; but he is at least a benevolent and peace-minded saint, though not a deity. Mr. H.G. Wells, in his magnificent *Outline of History*, (edition of 1937), has repeatedly stressed the indispensability of a Universal Spiritual Religion, freed from the dross and the grossnesses of priestcraft and superstitions (faith without reason), for the higher Civilisation of the World-State; (see his pp. 1147-8; also 373, 531-3, 593, 977-9). Joad's view, of the mood of modern western youth, has been quoted just before.

Section (3) makes an "Estimate of the Force and Permanence of the (above) Circumstances"; discusses pros and cons; expresses admiration of Pt. Roosevelt's method of popularising his programme by "directly addressing the American people over the wireless, simply, lucidly, familiarly, to explain *what* he is trying to do, *why*, what the *probable effects* will be, and what the *obstacles* are"; and concludes with a declaration of Joad's faith that "in spite of all evidence to the contrary, man really is at bottom a reasonable being", and that "the method of reasoned exposition is, after all, the only method compatible with liberty of the subject"; (pp. 55-65). Mr. Joad does not notice the inconsistency between the words 'liberty' and 'sub-ject'. "You have only to argue well enough, cogently enough, long enough, patiently enough, on behalf of your views, and then, if you are right, you will in the end persuade people, in spite of prejudice, bias, self-interest, and stupidity, to agree with you". If Mr Joad were asked, 'what if you are hanged or shot, ir-rationally, *before* your peace-ful and reason-ful persuasion has succeeded, by those force-fully ir-rational persons in power whom you are trying to persuade?'; he would probably answer, 'Then, the *inheritors* of my rational views must carry on the work of persuasion, in continuous succession, generation after generation'. History shows that that is how Mankind has advanced, by continual *martyrdom*, of one kind or another, to broader and broader liberties, with many very serious set-backs, as in the first half of this very twentieth century after Christ; but it also shows that mere *rational* persuasion has *not* been enough; 'biases, prejudices, self-interests, stupidities', have needed the further persuasion of *forcible sanctions*, of *danda*, punishment, which is clearly distinguished from *himsa*, violence, in the Samskr̥t *Smṛti-s*, the former being 'expiatory hurt to the guilty', and the latter, 'unjustifiable hurt to the innocent', 'hurt' to property or to

person, by imprisonment, restraints, forced labor, etc.; and that *danda* may be wielded rightly by the People, against their 'governors', when these, who are *paid* by the *People* to 'govern' well, i.e., to 'ad-minister' and 'serve', begin to *mis*-govern and wield it wrongly against the People. Lord Chancellor Haldane clearly said that Civil War was also 'constitutional'. But it was scarcely illuminating to say that. It is enough to say that law is not changed by law, but by *Public opinion*, which, with its *sanction* of a General Rising, *creates* Constitutions and Laws.

The following views of Joad also deserve to be critically considered in connection with his above-quoted views on 'The Mood of Contemporary Youth', the 'Need to believe propositions, simple, easily intelligible, authoritative', and the 'Effects of the decline of Religion'.

"In a speech, delivered in the autumn of 1933, on the subject of the burning of the books in Germany, Mr. H. G. Wells coined a memorable phrase, in description of the Fascist movements then sweeping over the Continent. They symbolize, he said, 'the revolt of the *clumsy lout* against civilisation.' What is the significance of the phrase? Let us suppose that every allowance is made for the effects upon Germany of the loss of the war; of her betrayal, in spite of President Wilson's promises, by the peace; of the humiliating provisions of the Treaty of Versailles, and in particular of the grossly unfair war-guilt clause; of the loss of her colonies and of parts of the Fatherland itself; of the wedge of alien territory driven through her Eastern provinces by the Polish corridor; of the humiliations to which her representatives were continuously subjected at Geneva; of her reluctant admission into the League; of the failure of the Allies to fulfil their moral promise to disarm; of the starvation of her people by a blockade protracted without mercy and beyond reason, long after the signing of the Armistice; of the grossly extortionate sums extracted from her by way of reparations; of the occupation of the Rhineland by foreign troops for twelve years after the war was over; of the occupation of the Ruhr by the French in 1923; of the destruction of middle-class savings by the depreciation of the mark in 1924; of the economic blizzard which descended with full force upon Germany in 1929. When we have made allowance for and discounted all these factors, (—a terrible indictment of the Allies, incidentally—), and others which might have been mentioned, *something still remains* for explanation if we are to understand fully

the significance of the Nazi revolution. This something, Wells diagnosed as *revolt*, conscious or unconscious, *against civilization as such*... When the process of change goes too fast, it engenders, inevitably, protest and reaction; the *protest* of those who, resenting their felt inferiority in face of the achievements, the knowledge, the competence, and the reputation of the clever, the cultivated, and the learned, are unconsciously looking for a chance of 'taking it out' of those who *make them feel inferior*; the *reaction* which is born of a desire to *return* to a *simpler* and *more familiar* form of *society*, in which discipline and courage are the virtues of the ruled, leadership and confident dogmatism of the rulers. Thus a civilization, in which the speed of *progress* has *outstripped* the capacity of the *average man* to keep up with it, is always in danger of slipping back to an earlier level as a result of his unconscious protest against the strain which it imposes upon him. 'We do not understand all this progress: and we do not hold with what little of it we understand. Therefore we are going to stop it, if we can.' So runs the unconscious argument, which underlies, according to this view, the reactionary movements of the contemporary world; whatever the guise of reputable political or sociological dogma, in which it clothes itself—the maintenance of *old traditions*, the *return to a simpler mode of life*, the *preservation of racial purity*, the '*clean-up*' of *moral licence or political corruption*, or shortly, simply, and mysteriously, 'the salvation of society'...' ; (190-1).

But 'progress' is desirable, is needed. How to avoid the revolt, the protest, the reaction? We have also to remember that "the clumsy lout" is also Nature's child, and has as much right to live his Life in his own way (without improperly hurting and hindering others) as the 'extra clever and cunning-brained, self-important, would-be boss of the whole show' has. The latter cannot be allowed to ride rough-shod over the former. Nature has arranged that the very speedy 'progress' of the tiger shall, now and then, be overturned completely by the strong horns of herds of slow cattle. Rāvaṇa's Golden Lankā, when Rāvaṇa became too unbearably oppressive and criminal, was over-whelmed by vast hordes of 'anthropoid men', under the generalship of Rāma; and Rāvaṇa himself was slain in single combat by Rāma. Is there no way to reconcile, and lead to co-operation instead of conflict, both 'clumsy clout' and 'brainy genius'? The old Indian answer is: 'Do not yoke bullocks with race-horses; do not try to *enslave* and *drive*

others ruthlessly *beyond* their capacity; 'make haste a little less rapidly'; and more than all else, *do not make the masses feel inferior*, by asserting and flaunting your 'superiority', your 'success', your 'achievements, reputation, wealth,' etc., too aggressively, too arrogantly, in the faces of the masses of the weaker; 'temper the wind to the shorn lambs'. No person tries to make a child do the same kind and amount of work as an adult; that 'child-labor' is a tragical fact in modern civilisation, is proof of the insanity of that civilisation, which allows over-population, and then over-works it, and finally over-whelms itself in vast butcheries.

There is much truth in Joad's remarks; but it is lopsided, incomplete; it needs to be completed, and balanced up, with the remainder of the truth; as is, and needs, Mahatma Gandhi's practical or actional exposition of 'truth'. There is Reason, inalienable, deep-seated, in man, no doubt. But there is also Un-Reason, Arbitrary Dual Desire, Egoistic and Altruistic, also ever-present; and it is the steam-power, the motive-force, of Life; indispensable, to drive; as much as Reason is, to regulate. Simple, easy, authoritative propositions, have their proper place and very great use; so have very complex and abstruse developments thereof. The series of elementary, advanced, and very highly advanced, text-books, in every science, are proof. 'Stepping on foot-throttles, rushing head-long', 'meals, movies, motors', 'making noises perpetually'—these are needed by the 'child'-mind, the 'young' mind; reposing, and yet very active, creative, thought, for the older-grown mind. As some Frenchman has said piquantly, 'every new generation is a fresh invasion of savages'; it has to be added, 'which has to be guided to civilisation by its older generation'; also, among children, there are 'angels' as well as 'savages'. The simple village life, advocated by Mahatma Gandhi, and simple faiths, are best, because temperamentally most suited and desired, for a large majority of human beings, as yet; the complicated life of towns and greater intellectual activity, for a growing minority. Mechanical routine in daily life is not only 'not un-desirable' but is necessary—within limits. Even geniuses have to cultivate 'regular habits', if they are not 'to madness near allied', and have sense enough to wish to avoid premature breakdowns. The 'orbs of space' have very long lives, because they have '*very mechanical*, regular, endlessly repetitive cyclical habits'. The mechanical 'spinning', recommended by M. Gandhi, is, to some persons, a great help to

repose of mind, or quiet thinking, like the rosary.

In short, everything is useful, is good, if in reason and *in season*, in proper time-place-condition, if not in excess, if within limits—to settle which proper conditions and limits, is work and duty of *circum-spect*, *extro-spect*, and *intro-spect*, Reason.

Compare the following further views of Joad, with his above quoted invincible belief in human reasonableness. "Men embrace propositions which there is no reason to think true, with a fervour which is inversely proportional to their truth. Where the truth is known, nobody displays any enthusiasm on its behalf. Where it is, and must remain, unknown, men supply the place of knowledge by conjectural dogmas, and persecute whoever refuses to share the dogmas. For the true belief that 7 times 7 makes 49, nobody has been anxious to make the world uncomfortable for anybody. But on behalf of the dogmas announced by States and Religions, of which none could be known to be true and the truth of any one of which would have involved the falsity of all the rest, they have fought with prodigious energy and died with invariable enthusiasm. *Most men have a need to believe. They like to be told what to think and what to do.* That is why the Church and the Army have always been their two most popular institutions. It is necessary that the *propositions* belived in should be *simple, intelligible*, and presented with an *authoritative* backing. Granted this, men will defend their beliefs to the last ounce of their energy and the last drop of their blood, regarding it as the height of wickedness to act otherwise than in accordance with them, and inflicting appalling cruelties on all who venture to do so. That the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, or that he proceeds from the Father only; that Christ's nature was composite or that it was simple; that bread and wine are or are not body and blood, or that in some mysterious sense they both are and are not, at the same time; that, during a period of four years and three and a half months, *Germans were wicked and Englishmen virtuous*, or, alternatively, that *Englishmen were wicked and Germans virtuous*, are propositions in defence of which men have killed one another in thousands. Yet it is difficult to be sure that any one of these propositions is quite true, and highly probable that most of them are untrue. Looking back over the history of human enthusiasm evoked on behalf of Error, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the *best guarantee* of the *falsehood* of a belief is that large numbers of human

beings should be found to hold it with *passionate intensity*. It is just because men cleave with such *perfervid eagerness* to whatever beliefs promise to *console their spirits* or to *gratify their pride*," (ineradicable needs) "that we must be doubly anxious in the interests of truth to obtain a fair hearing for the expression of heterodoxy, protest, and dissent"; (137-8).

This is a finely worded passage, and there is much in it which will meet acceptance in many quarters. Yet its argument must not be pursued too far. Political 'truths' are seldom, perhaps never, so self-evident as arithmetical. The whole of Joad's book is a *plea* for Liberty. He holds his belief on the subject with 'quiet conviction' and 'reposeful assurance', let us allow. But if he were forcibly prevented from expressing the belief in book-form, he would probably begin to feel 'passionally intense' and 'perfervidly eager'. Also 'men in power', 'rulers', hold their views of *not* granting liberty to the 'subject', with quiet assurance; although Joad and very many others, indeed all 'sub-jected' masses, hold those views to be very erroneous. Mere absence of fervour and quietness of conviction are not always 'guarantees of truth'. They often mean, when present in 'rulers' minds, only 'silent contempt' for opposite views. And the 'silent contempt' turns into 'passionately intense' and violent repression, often, at any sign of disobedience on the part of the 'sub-jects' and the 'ruled'. In short, the argument must be kept within due limits. Surely, Joad must be in entire sympathy with Cromwell's Rebellion and the American and the French Revolutions, as he is, to a large extent, by the statements in his book, with the Russian. Indeed, it has been held that a person does not *really believe* unless he *acts* accordingly. 'Men are judged by *deeds*; trees by fruits'; 'action' tests belief; spirits *ought* to be consoled and *righteous* pride gratified, by *right* beliefs which will satisfy *head* and *heart* both.

Joad's arguments, here and there, are very debatable; some statements are questionable; and conclusions, and counsels as to what action to take, are unsatisfying and very feeble, as compared, f.i., with Zilliacus', and with the action actually taken by the Labor Party, after the outbreak of this war, in order to get into the Cabinet.¹ But his book as a whole is so interesting, informing, and well-reasoned, that the temptation is great, to quote more fully. It must be resisted, however; and only a few more abridged extracts must suffice.

¹See *Labour in the War*, by John Price, (1940).

"The belief that there is an antithesis between political liberty and the economic changes which socialists desire, is a delusion. It is only necessary to examine *the content of the word 'Liberty'* to see the fallacy. Paine's standard definition is : 'Liberty consists in the *right to do* whatever is not contrary to the *rights* of others.' This defines only *liberty of action*. What must be added to embrace the *full content* of political liberty? That we should be able freely (a) to express our thoughts and desires, on the platform, at the street corner, in the press ; (b) to worship what God and how we please, or worship no God at all ; (c) to invoke the law in our defence against the highest in the land ; ..that (d) the law should be what we ourselves, through elected representatives in Parliament, determine—these things, and others like them, taken together, constitute what we mean by liberty. Which of these things militates against the economic change; desired by *Socialists*? They want a *Planned Economy, Production for Use instead of Profit, and Economic Equality*" ; (pp. 75-77).

It may be noted that though Joad proposes to *add* to Paine's definition, which, he says, is concerned with 'liberty of *action*'; he really does not add anything to it; but only mentions various *kinds of overt physical action*, regarding which there should be liberty. Obviously, such *internal, mental, action as thinking*—has never been and can never be forcibly restrained except by drugs, which, however, do not restrain, but destroy, thinking ; and propaganda do not restrain, but mislead. Only the *expression* of thought, by speech or writing, has been and can be restrained by force.

Pt Roosevelt has, repeatedly, within the last year, said that *Freedom means Freedom* (1) of Speech, (2) of Worship (3) from Want, (4) from Fear. Psychologically, all the freedoms that are desired and desirable, are reducible to *Freedom from Fear*, of non-right-ful, i.e., wrongful, *interference by others*. This brings us back to the words 'right' and 'rights' in Paine's definition ; and as soon as those words (and the corresponding inseparable 'duty' and 'duties') come up, so soon the need to define, delimit, declare their meaning by *law*, comes up ; and with that, the need for an elected *legislature*, in accordance with Abraham's Lincoln's definition of Self-government, as *corrected* by ancient Indian Sages.

Joad discusses the only two ways to the realisation of the Socialist demand, "the chief impediment to which is—veste

interests in private property." These ways are, "(1) the gradual transformation of the present system in response to the will of the majority, constitutionally expressed through the ballot-box; and (2) its overthrow by revolutionary upheaval." As to the second, Joad contents himself with saying that *it would fail in Britain*; and mentions reasons. It may be said, generally speaking, that he concerns himself throughout the rest of the book, with the first, and returns again and again, along various lines, to the method of slow and steady persuasion. "Modern civilisation demands, as a condition, not merely of its advancement, but of its survival, (a) the abolition of war, (b) the *supersession of national sovereignties*, (c) the control and rationing of the worlds' raw materials, (d) the assessment of an *optimum population* for the civilised world, steps to *ensure that no nation shall increase its population beyond the limit* assigned to it. Yet all these things are enormously in advance of public opinion, today"; (p. 92). The desiderata are all very well put. Only, as regards the last sentence, it may be said that within less than a year and a half of the writing of the above, the second World War broke out; grabbed 'public opinion' and its *Mis-Leaders*, pervert 'propagandists,' by the neck; and is 'persuading' them with tremendous blows instead of sweet reasoning, and doing the work of the second way, viz., 'revolutionary upheaval', with terrible effectiveness.

On the vital question of who should elect and who should be elected, Joad says: "Only those must make the laws who have to obey them. It is only the wearer who knows where the shoe pinches"; (140). Every wearer of a shoe can tell where it pinches; but very few can make shoes which do not pinch; and most wearers of shoes can tell, after being taught by experience, who are the few that can make 'good and wise' shoes; if there are really any such within reach. Therefore, while "we should not expect the ordinary citizen to have sufficient knowledge of complex political and economic issues to determine, unaided, what ought to be done; we have a right to ask that he should be given *such education* as will enable him to *judge*...which experts are *trustworthy*. Aristotle remarked that it is the characteristic of an educated man to know in a general way what is and what is not possible in a particular sphere. It is precisely this sort of education that democracy, if it is to survive, must give its citizens;" (103-4). We have noted before, repeatedly, the 'virtuous circles' of good and wise

'social organisation', 'persons', 'laws'. Good individuals make good society; and vice versa. So education and civilisation. So seed and fruit. So good-swa-s and Good-Swa-raj. The individual problem is the world-problem; and the world-problem is the world-problem. The *Ashrama-Dharma* and the *Varṇa-Dharma* cover and solve both. In the last hundred pages of his eu-topian work, *The Shape of Things to Come*, (and over and over again in his other writings), Wells repeatedly stresses the need of "educational revolution for remoulding mankind", and says that "Social Psychology should become, so to speak, the whole literature, philosophy, and general thought of the world", and that "the world, now divided among territorial great Powers, should become divided among functional Great Powers", which, in co-ordination, will constitute the "World-State or World-Organisation". Four main functional Great Powers" are what is meant by *Varnas*.¹

Joad quotes from "*Liberty and Democratic Leadership*", a manifesto published in 1934, over the signatures of 150 prominent men and women...(It says :) The peril of dictatorship will remain, unless the institutions of democracy can be made into effective instruments of Government. We must restore the electors' confidence in Parliament and enhance its value, not only as the home of free discussion, but as a *Council of Action for National Re-construction*". The Manifesto makes "recommendations for Cabinet direction by Ministers freed from Departmental work", etc. It may be noted that Mr. Churchill has appointed a member of Ministers without portfolios, in 1941. "At this moment, we have in Britain a public that is anxious beyond all precedent for calm, efficient, and active leadership; a public that must not be threatened or played down to, but must be informed, convinced, and led. Democracy should be treated with a new respect, offering *Scientific Schemes* of a far-sighted and far-reaching order, commending them by the methods of reason, and asking that they should be judged on their merits alone"; (208, 218). The *I.N. Congress* should note.

Over and over again he stresses the need for *Right Education* of young and old, and states his ideas of "What Education for citizenship implies", on pp. 212-218. "There is on all hands today a disappointment with the effects of popular education"; (p. 47). "Today, there is a growing demand that education for citizenship should be given in our schools...

¹See *The Essential Unity of All Religions*, pp. 618-620.

Young people should possess some knowledge of the world in which they live, of its problems and their origin, and its recent history. They should be taught geography, civics i.e., structure of Government, local, national, and international, current history, politics, economics, psychology; in such a way that they may *acquire capacity for critical judgment*, and keep on guard against false propaganda. History should be taught, *not as the National history of a country, but as the Universal history of the Human Race.*" The present writer has endeavoured to expound elsewhere¹ the ancient Indian System of Education, under eight heads, (a) What is education?, (b) Why should there be any; what is its purpose?, (c) What should be taught?, (d) To Whom; should the same education be given to all, or of different sorts to different types of educands?, (e) When should it be given, at what periods, times, hours, of the life, the year, the day?, (f) Where; in the home, in schools, colleges, universities, under roofs, under trees, in the open air, under a residential system, or to day-scholars?, (g) How should it be given? (h) Who should educate; who is the person fit to be entrusted with the work of teaching the new generation; what qualifications should he possess? He believes, and has tried to show, that the best elements of all that Joad, Russell, and others who have written on education, and the great precursor of them, Herbert Spencer, also German Froebel, Swiss Pestalozzi, Italian Montessori, Russian Pinkevich, and American Dewey and Kilpatrick—is to be found in the old Guru-kula system of India, prescribed by Manu for the Educational Organisation of the people; together with something more, which is almost more important, viz., *ré vocational* teaching and training, according to each student's natural temperament and aptitude, so as to fit him to find, or be given, and to take, his proper place in the Social Structure readily. This last aspect has not been touched by Joad; yet it is vitally important. Dr. C. S. Myers' National Institute of Industrial Psychology (London) seems to be doing good pioneer-work in this direction.

It may be noted that Wells' *Outline of History* and *Short History of the World* seem to be generally recognised as about the best available manuals, at present, of such 'Universal History' as Joad speaks of. As regards his "education for

¹*The Science of Social Organisation, or the Laws of Manu.*

citizenship", Wells' view has been quoted just before, that Social Psychology should become the general thought of the world. In ancient India, this vital desideratum was fulfilled by the universal teaching of the principles of Manu's *Varna-Ashrama-Dharma*. It should be carefully borne in mind, in this connection, that, in origin, *Varṇas* meant the *four main vocational* or professional *typical classes*, corresponding to the *four main* psychological types of human beings; *not hereditary castes*. How classes hardened into castes, Wells has briefly and excellently described in *Outline of History*; and many other writers have dealt with the subject in various ways, leading to the same conclusion.

On his last two pages (220, 221) Joad says : "If the advocates of liberal ideas meet violence with violence, denunciation with denunciation, bitterness with bitterness, they will assist in generating an atmosphere in which power is unconstitutionally seized by a forceful minority, and liberty is consigned to the limbo of the outmoded shibboleths of an obsolete democracy...Defend liberty coolly and with reasoned argument". Very fine, when it is a matter of convincing 'public opinion' only, by lectures and pamphlets. But what is to be done when governments, cliques, coteries, and men in irresponsible power have to be convinced, who, while the 'subjects' are 'defending liberty coolly, with reasoned argument', either ignore the argument more coolly, when they themselves are being addressed; or, when the general public is being addressed, resort very hotly to all sorts of methods of repression, including Black-and-Tans, Amritsar Massacres and Martial law horrors, and Peshawar and Sholapur shootings, etc.; than which Nazist or Bolshevik outrages can scarcely be much worse; and, while insisting on the observance of peaceful and 'constitutional' methods by the people, themselves violate them all, and sterilise their observance by the people, by turning 'democratic' elections into vicious, brutal, and tragical farces, by means of the anti-constitutional, electioneering Tammany methods of (a) cajoling, gerrymandering, (b) grafting, boodling, corruption, subornation, (c) dissension-sowing, wedge-driving, (d) bullying, intimidation, torturing, and even downright murdering, through gangsters? At the most and best, Joad's advice is wholly insular and *good for England only*, scarcely even for the rest of Britain; and it is no good at all for 'subjected and exploited' countries. The following sentences of his, not only make this clear, but implicitly admit

that, elsewhere, such advice has been found inapplicable in the past, and, in similar circumstances, must be so in the future also. He says: "In the *great struggles of history*, which have involved the transference of power in the community, the *self-sacrifice and statesmanship required for peaceful adjustment* have been *usually lacking*. In this respect, our *English record* gives ground for *hope*. The distinguishing feature of English history is the *political genius* of the *English* people...The transference of power from a feudal aristocracy to an urban middle class involved Europe in centuries of intermittent war. In England it was managed with one *small* (?) war and a couple of bloodless (?) revolutions. In 1832, in the height of the industrial crisis which followed the close of the Napoleonic War, we contrived, without bloodshed, by the instrument of the Reform Bill, to transfer power from the landowning aristocracy to the industrial middle class. Today, a hundred years later, in a situation not dissimilar, created by a post-war crisis not less severe, we are faced by the necessity of effecting a further economic readjustment. The economic changes demanded by Socialists involve a transference of power even more difficult than that which was effected in 1832. We are today witnessing the *fury* of the *struggle* which the *demand* for these changes has *provoked on the Continent*. It may well be that the question whether any civilisation is to survive at the end of the struggle depends on our ability in *England* to effect the same transition without the cruelty and bloodshed that it *has involved* in Russia, Italy, Germany, Austria."

Mr. Joad has nothing to say about the working of *such* English political genius in Ireland, or in India, or in North America in the 1770's, or in South Africa in the days which were followed by the Boer War. He has noticed a very different aspect of that genius, earlier in his book, as putting 50000 persons in prison for political reasons, in India. Would he be able to say that the bloodshed *involved* in Russia, etc., was *avoidable* by cool and reasoned argument? The implication of his language is that it was *not*. Has—the 'English political genius' succeeded in *really* avoiding bloodshed even in England, since his book was published? Mr. Zilliacus' book, quoted from before, shows conclusively that it has not. Though, technically, the cruelty and bloodshed of a *civil war* have been avoided *within* England; a war which *might* well have been *no bigger* and *no more bloody*

than that of the Cromwellian Revolution he refers to; yet, really, the *whole* of *Britain* was flung in 1914, and has been flung again, since Sep. 1939, into a *totalitarian war*, *outside as well as inside* England and the rest of Britain; a *much more cruel, bloody, ruinous* war; by the obdurate refusal of the men and the cliques in power to listen to 'cool and reasoned argument.' If the method of *rational persuasion*, argument, honest mutual consultation, were *sincerely* followed by *both*, if they were really 'administrators' and 'administered', instead of 'governors' and 'governed', 'rulers' and 'ruled', 'over-riders' and 'sub-jects', then, of course, all these difficulties would vanish as by magic. A very good way of keeping up such mutual persuasion would be for every Government to maintain, openly, a daily, (indeed, a large weekly should suffice), *explaining* its policies and measures, answering questions and objections, and accepting suggestions which it sees reasons to regard as good, all in friendly, comrade-like, *famil(y)i-ar* fashion. Instead of doing so, governments speak pompously, with grave, distant, superior airs, indirectly, guardedly, evasively, non-committally diplomatically, through one or two *others'* papers, which the public come to regard as 'organs' of the Governments. Occasionally, 'communiques' are issued by Governments, and published in all important dailies. At least that is what happens in India. Why can they not speak through proper 'mouths' of their own, instead of such mouth-pieces? Or, perhaps better, and less expensive to Government and newspaper-buyer alike, issue communiques more frequently and regularly, explaining policy and answering objection, in the manner suggested above; which communiques would be published by all dailies? Let them do so, and all misunderstanding, all mutual bitterness and hate, all acrimonious 'criticism' by the people, all violent revolutionary and rebellious tendencies on their part, would be avoided.

Let us now turn to Laski's book, *Liberty in the Modern State*.¹ It is less systematically arranged; but is equally

¹To the f.n. ¹ at p. 391, *supra*, it may be added that hundreds of books have been written, in English alone, and thousands of articles in periodicals, on Liberty, Democracy, Socialism, and allied subjects. Joad's and Laski's books have been selected here, for discussion, for the reasons mentioned in that f.n.. Mr. H.G.Wells is the most indefatigable,

interesting, informing, 'modern', livingly written. Some of its leading ideas, and its conclusions have been already discussed ; (pp. 53-66, *supra*). The main ideas are very much the same as those of the other book ; and, in various ways, the two may be regarded as supplementing one another. Some abridged quotations may be made here ; with comments intercalated.

"In the seven years (ending 1938), the condition of liberty has deteriorated over most of the civilised world...In this, Germany does not stand alone ; (pp. 11, 12) . Ours is a period of which the major characteristic is *insecurity* ; it has bred fears and hates, which are incompatible with freedom ; freedom

able, vigorous, popular, widely-read writer, as well as active and effective worker for the spread of his ideas. Mr. Bertrand Russell seems to be another influential writer. His lucid, small, yet comprehensive book, *Roads to Freedom* (1920), G.D.H. Cole's *Guide through World Chaos* (1933), and article on 'Guild Socialism' in the Enc. Brit. (1929, 14th edn.), and the powerful and vividly written little book by G.R.S. Taylor, *The Guild State* (1919), largely quoted from by Annie Besant in her pamphlet, *The Guild System as a substitute for Trade Unionism* (1921)—these three have been analysed and discussed in the present writer's *Ancient versus Modern Scientific Socialism*. All seem to be agreed that "pressure of population and private monopolisation of sources of wealth", in the words of Wells ; "tyranny of money and pressure of population", in those of Russell ; 'mammonism and erotism' in those of psychology ; are the ultimate causes of all the miseries of modern mankind ; that regulation and restriction of these are the remedy ; and that armed war and larger and larger States in the field of politics, and business-competition and larger and larger trade unions, on the one hand, and combines, mergers, 'trusts', international companies and concerns, on the other—that these are the cruel preparation for the final integration of a World-State wielding a World Control of Business. In the course of thousands of years of fighting, myriads of tribal chieftaincies and thousands of small kingships have gradually merged into the sixty or seventy governments of modern times. These have to merge into one World State. So, hundreds of huge competing firms into one World Business. Annie Besant's *The Changing World*, expounded this idea thirty years ago.

can exist only where there is tolerance...The (last World) War was a supreme expression of the insecurity which lay at the basis of our *social system*; it was born of *international anarchy*, which, in turn, was rooted in *competing economic systems*...The League of Nations cannot fulfil its major purposes so long as its members are (independent) *sovereign states*. The *supreme need* of our time is *cosmopolitan law-making*, (i.e. a World-Order, a World-Federation, to which all States shall submit)...*Wholesale Reconstruction* involves abrogation of privileges inherent in the ownership of economic power...In Great Britain, the two major parties (Liberal and Labour) were in agreement that the economic organisation must remain fundamentally *capitalist*....A great *programme of rearmament* has temporarily stabilised the position of capitalism;" (17-22). It has given widespread employment at good wages, and so "the Labor Movement has been unable, or unwilling, to threaten seriously the present structure of social life;" (14)... "To transform the ultimate economic foundations of society is the most hazardous enterprise... *Perhaps*, even, it cannot be accomplished save by *violent conflict*...But there is no remedy now for our ills, save *Planned Production* for community consumption...If we *organise for this end in time*, we may *persuade* men, *peacefully* to acquiesce in this transformation; and then we shall have accomplished the *most beneficent revolution*;" (39).

The "immense gains", and the "heavy shadows" of the Soviet, its great merits and great demerits, are discussed on pp. 40-47. "*Liberty and Equality* are complementary. Equality does not mean *identity* of treatment. The *variety* of *human nature*, differences of both *hereditary capacity* and *social nurture*, are inescapable...Equality means recognition of *urgent need in all*—food, clothing, shelter, (i.e., the 'necessaries' of life)—before there is special recognition of *non-urgent claims* in any. Such *equality* is inescapably connected with *freedom*...It means such an *organisation of opportunity* that *no man's personality* suffers *frustration*, to the private benefit of others;" (52-54).

This 'organisation of opportunity,' 'equality of opportunity', as it is now generally called, is *impossible* without Systematic Social Organisation; (see App. C.); but on this vitally important point, as to *what* that Systematic Organisation should be, Laski, like Joad, has no specific suggestions to make. His view as to the "uniqueness of individuality" has been

discussed before ; (pp. 62-3, *supra*). He himself seems to modify his too unqualified first statement, (at his p. 58), by subsequent explanations, (at his pp. 90, 122, 147, 159, 182, 185, etc.). Thus, "The *individual* does not stand alone ; he joins hands with others of *like mind* ;" of "kindred interest". "There is enough *similarity* of view...to make enough of *unity* to achieve order and peace ; but that similarity is not identity." "No man stands alone ; he lives *with* others, and *in* others." And so on. The 'necessaries' are 'universal', generally speaking ; the "non-urgent claims" are 'unique', special, personal.

Metaphysics tells us that what Laski speaks of as "uniqueness of individuality" and regards as 'complex', is in reality only the *feel* of *separateness*, a 'simplex', 'I am I' and 'you are you'—nothing else; the 'complexity' is varying perpetually. This *Principle* of the *feel* of *separate-ness* is inherent in the Duality of Nature, as much as the *Principle* of the *feel* of *All-One-ness*. The word 'We', inclusive of any number of 'I's', implies that; the facts of Sym-pathy, As-socia-tion, Society, Family—all inherently imply it; and would be impossible without it.¹

¹Laski speaks of 'universe' and 'multiverse'; (p. 90); Etymologically, and philosophically, '*uni-verse*' means 'all things, all *multi-tudes*, *turning round and round* One Thing', viz., the Self. Whatever particular thing, fact, feeling, thought, experience, the Self attaches itself to, whatever it makes 'the hot point of consciousness', (as William James vividly puts it), that becomes its 'complex' and 'unique individuality', at that particular time and place. The dial, as a whole, remains ever the same ; but move the needle, on the dial, from one point to another, and another 'unique individuality' appears, forthwith. All beings are passing through all the infinite sorts of thoughts, desires, volitions, sensations, joys, sorrows, body-vehicles, all possible experiences—*turn by turn*. The Universal Self includes them all, past, present, future, all at once ; and It is the source of the Similarity, the Uniformity, which also we see in the 'uni-multi-verse', at the same time as Dis-similarity and Multi-formity. Like the word auto-matic', the word 'unique' has two entirely opposite meanings, 'All-One', Al-one, On(e)ly, and also 'each one, separate from every other one'.

Let us put it concretely. Take a score of circular discs; divide each into a score of sectors by as many radii; paint each sector with a different color; sector no. 1 of each disc, the same

"No person is secure in liberty, unless there is a separation of the judicial from the executive power"; (67). The two continue to be combined in India, despite perpetual

color; no. 2 of each, the same other color; and so on; place the discs one upon another, so that they coincide exactly, color by color; drive a pin through the twenty centres. Each of these discs has a '*unique individuality*'; but can you *distinguish* any one from any other, except by its 'place' and its 'time', i. e., number, in the heap? Each is only a simplex, *separate* from every other. Now let us twist each disc round, so that no sector coincides with a similarly colored sector above or below it. At once each disc acquires a 'complex and unique individuality', as *compared* with every other. Let us further change the 'score' into 'an infinite number'; the 'centres' into 'life-centres', 'souls', 'magnitude-less *points* of vitality'; the pin into 'a *line* which has length without breadth'; and we may get some idea of what the Vedanta means when it speaks of Unity enveloping and pervading all Multiplicity all at once, eternally, infinitely, motionlessly, while the Multitudes are ever moving round and round in cycles and circles within that Unity. For other illustrations and detailed exposition, the reader may see *The Science of Peace*. Without the solution of the Final 'Why' by Vedanta-Metaphysic-Psychology, viz., *Why this Ever-Changing World-Process at all*; without this, questions upon questions, why's upon why's, will go on multiplying, branching out from one another, endlessly. Only when we arrive at and grasp the Un-Changing, do Why's and How's cease. Without the foundation of that final solution, the superstructures of Politics, Economics, Padagogics, etc., will always be shaking, crumbling down, rebuilding; society will never be properly, firmly, scientifically organised, but only repeatedly misorganised and disorganised.

Certain patent psychological facts may also be pondered, to understand the nature of 'individuality' and of its 'unique-ness'. 'Multiple personality', 'layers of the sub-supra-unconscious mind', 'conversions', 'complete changes of character', 'sinners becoming saints; saints become sinners', 'persons becoming unrecognisable, through lapse of time and change of face, figure, character, physically and mentally'—all these are well-known facts. Where are our countless forgotten yet revivable memories hidden? Great epic poets, novelists, dramatists, historians, painters, sculptors, actors, create, depict,

demands for separation, inside and outside the legislatures, and also despite repeated *promises* by the Government that the separation would be made very early.¹

"Law is not merely a command; it is also an appeal... Authority... lives, not by its power to command, but by its power to *convince*;" (89). "Power is not conferred upon men for the sake of power, but to enable them to achieve *Ends which win Happiness for each of us*"; (92). *What* are these *Ends*? Only sound Philosophy-Psychology can define. *How* can they be achieved? By a sound Social Organisation based on that Philosophy-Psychology, which is Essential Religion also. Western thought can scarcely be said to have answered this *What* and this *How*. Old Eastern thought has.² The Indian National Congress has not thought fit to spend time yet on these vital matters, except (, and that, very imperfectly and superficially,) in

describe, enact, hundreds of 'unique individuals' and 'dramatis personæ'; they *identify* themselves with *each*, in succession; 'enter into' each; otherwise they could not make their creations 'living'. The same face, in a smile, is very different, unrecognisable sometimes, in a frown. Such considerations should show us how there are *many* 'unique individualities' within *each* 'unique individuality, larger and smaller, endlessly; atoms with worlds; worlds within atoms, beyond count and computation, supra-worlds within infra-worlds, infra-worlds within supra-worlds, *ad infinitum*; and all within the One Self.

¹On one occasion, in 1937, a Government spokesman in the Central Assembly, explained the delay by *lack of finances*. He said that, to make the change, in the Punjab alone, would cost an additional sum of fifty to sixty *thousand* rupees (about four thousand pounds, in British money), per annum. The present writer, then in the Central Legislature, pointed out that Government had easily found about fifteen *crores* (one hundred and fifty *millions*) of rupees, to spend on the largely useless Government palaces of new Delhi; but found it difficult to provide five or six hundred thousand rupees a year, for all the provinces of India, together, by their own calculation, in order to discharge their primary, essential, vital function of ensuring justice to the people; and took cover under a flimsy excuse which an intelligent schoolboy would be ashamed to make. There was no reply.

²See App. C.

connection with the (Motilal) Nehru Committee's Scheme of Swaraj or Draft Constitution for India (1928) and the Karachi Resolution re Fundamental Rights (1931); which were mostly copied from western models. There has been no effort yet, (October, 1941), on the part of the Congress, to tell the public *How*, specifically, it will *use* power, when it achieves that power; in *what ways*; along what lines of legislation, relating to the several main departments and aspects of the People's life; so as to promote General Welfare, and achieve *Ends*; which Ends too it has not specified yet; though it has been desiring and demanding *Power*—implied by the word Swa-raj or Self-government—all these many years. But a hope has arisen that it may do so now; (see p. 290, f.n.)

In ch. II, headed "Freedom of the Mind", (meaning freedom of *expression* of the mind), Laski discusses the pros and cons of restriction at great length, with much subtlety to and fro. "Authority was emphatically and dangerously abused in the Amritsar rebellion (? Massacre, of a wholly unarmed peaceful gathering of men, women, and children, of whom between four and five hundred were killed outright, and some twelve hundred were reported to have received wounds), of 1919...Whether you study repression in Ireland or Russia, Bavaria or Hungary or India, its history is always the same...The proper protection of the individual is deliberately neglected in the belief that a reign of terror will minimise disaffection"; in other words, that beating, hurting, killing will create affection! "There is no evidence that it does. If it could, there would have been no Russian Revolution; and there would be no movement for Indian Self-government today"; (115-116). His conclusion is that, "Force is never a reply to argument; and until argument itself seeks force as the expression of its principle, it is only by argument that it can justifiably be countered"; (149).

It has to be understood that this is right only if it applies to *both* the parties concerned, rulers and ruled; that *both* must be willing to listen to argument and to reply by argument; and that *neither* must resort to force. What is to be done if the rulers do *not* listen to argument? Neither Mr. Joad, nor Mr. Laski, answers this question explicitly; but both *imply* that in such a case 'armed civil war' would be justifiable. Mahatma Gandhi has discovered an answer, which is certainly far better, in the peculiar conditions of India, viz., 'Non-Violent unarmed Civil Disobedience'; the

principle and the method of the General Strike (*without sabotage*), extended from the field of Economics and Industry to that of Politics. If it succeeds, as it *may*, in India, in the present special conditions of the world, and *will*, if combined with a reason-satisfying and therefore really all-uniting declaration of the specific policies of the desired Swaraj; then it will be taken up by other similarly-circumstanced peoples also, successfully; and will win for Mahatma Gandhi, the profound gratitude of Mankind for centuries upon centuries.

In the third chapter, 'Liberty and Social Power', Laski stresses the need for Right Education; (166-168). In another connection he says, "In any society, men only have an equal interest in freedom when they have an equal interest in the results...Any society, the fruits of whose economic operations are *unequally* distributed, will be compelled to deny freedom...; and the same will be true of any society in process of forcible transition from one way of life to another. Cromwellian England, Revolutionary France, Communist Russia, Fascist Italy, each of these, of set purpose, made an end of the pretence that *freedom*" [un-limited] "was a justifiable object of desire. In each, it was proposed to maintain *some particular form of Social Organisation* at any cost..... In England, or France, or Germany, there is *no freedom* where the fundamentals of the society are called into question, if their rulers think that this may cause danger to those questions (? fundamentals); (169, 173-4).¹

¹It has been said above, more than once, that Emergency Powers, taken by the British Government, for wartime, have been exercised with great moderation, discretion, consideration, *within Britain itself*. *The National Herald* (Lucknow), 7-10-1941, publishes an article headed "Our Liberties; a Fortress, by Harold J. Laski, in Home Service". In this article, Mr. Laski discusses "Whether the powers as used by the Government have been employed in such a way as to justify the argument of those who claim that our fundamental civil liberties are in serious danger". He gives statistics of prosecutions and detentions, and concludes that if we "set that record against the record of any other State, belligerent or neutral, we are entitled to be proud of the comparison". But he adds that "I do *not* for one moment wish to say that we can afford to *relax our vigilance*"; and that "*the zeal for freedom among the people is the one vital safeguard of freedom*".

So far as *India* is concerned, there is no indication that Laski has changed his view, which *strongly condemns* the British Government's, and specially Mr. Churchill's, ways. His article (*II. Times*, 23-1-1941), quoted at p. 363 *supra*, is fairly recent.

Another article by Mr. Laski, reprinted in *II. Times*,

He mentions that two newspapers, *The Daily Worker* and *The Week*, have been suppressed by the Home Secretary, Mr. Morrison; and says that "these two cases apart, public opinion, so far as press comment is concerned, has remained free during the war". He says, "I myself, quite frankly, regret it", (the suppression of the papers by executive action), and thinks that it would have been better to bring "a case against those journals before a judge"; but adds that "Mr. Morrison had an unanswerable case and...public opinion has been strongly on his side". The comment may be made, that it is by careful choice of words, that Mr. Laski seems to avoid contradicting, here, some things he has said in his book; that Laborites have been taken into the Cabinet profusely by Mr. Churchill, because Labor is strong, and knows that its help is absolutely indispensable for the prosecution of the war; that, through its spokesmen, it practically threatened the Government with withdrawal, if the Government did not fulfil its demands, (see John Price, *Labour in the War, with a foreword by the Rt Hon. Ernest Bevin, M. P.*—pub. 1940; particularly pp. 89-98); some of which spokesmen have, since then, been taken into the Cabinet and other important offices; that therefore, Labor, which has for some years now, constituted the Opposition in the British Parliament, has been able to effectively control the use of Emergency Powers; and, finally, that Labor, formerly opposed to the entrance of Britain into war against Germany, as shown by Zilliacus, and by Laski too, in their books, was weakened in its opposition, by the extensive and well-paid employment provided by the vast preparation for, and then the actual commencement and prosecution of, the war; and has now been led to give its whole heart to it, through *indignation* caused by the actual bombardment of Britain by Germany, and through the *hope* of a Better World to be built *after* the war has been *won*; which hope has combined with the indignation to send into oblivion, for the time being, the socialistic *principles* on which Labor's opposition was founded.

27-10-1941, from *Reynolds News*, headed "Mr. Winston Churchill", pays high tribute to his "eminence beyond all prospect of rivalry"; his "immense *qualities*, his courage, audacity, energy, great imaginative insight"; but goes on to say that these "ought not to blind us to his *defects*"; "there is considerable danger that...*immense power* may *obscure* from him the depth and urgency of the...serious and weighty *criticisms* that are felt about his administration, not merely among the *people generally*, but, not least, among those who watch it from near at hand";... "Mr. Churchill is developing a habit of *petulance* about the criticisms he receives". Then, in over a dozen paras, Mr. Laski makes as many specific criticisms, regarding separate affairs; towards the end he writes, "He (Mr. Churchill) has *not grasped* at all, either the public sense of the *need for great social and economic changes*, or the public sense that *their completion* (i.e., of these changes), as part of the war effort, is both a way of maintaining public morale and the *supreme method of communicating* the BONA FIDES of our *war purpose* to the subject millions of the continent...It is *vital* for him to *convince the world*, *not only* that he can *will* what is right, *but also* that he *knows what it is right to will*..." In plain words, it is not enough to talk "in a torrent of superb rhetoric" about a 'Better World', 'a new heaven and a new earth'; you must *explain*, in some detail, *how* you propose to do it, *what* is your *specific programme* for achieving it.

The same issue of the *H. Times*, 27-10-1941, reprints from the *New Statesman and Nation*, an article by Mr. Lionel Fielden, formerly Controller of Broadcasting in India, which exposes, in a lively manner, the farce of the new enlarged Executive Council and the new Defence Council of the Viceroy.

The *National Herald*, 23-10-1941, publishes two remarkable articles, which are very relevant here. Both deserve to be reproduced in full; but we must content ourselves with abridged extracts.

One is headed, "Missionaries Fight for Civil Liberties". It says that two American Methodist Missionaries, Mr. Harold Buell and Mr. Ernest A. Becker, have just had to resign from the Lucknow Christian College, because they were "forced to make the choice between God and Cæsar", and they chose God. "...Mr. Buell, in his letter of resignation, stated: 'To be silent in the face of injustice and exploitation would be to deny Christ...I choose Christ.'...The missionaries

could not give up their right to preach against war or condemn British injustice to India...In his letter of resignation to the Presbyterian Board, Foreign Missions, New York, Mr. Becker says: 'I believe war to be a sin. You believe war to be a sin I am not afraid to say so. And yet you are asking me to break my pledge to speak out against unrighteousness and to remain silent, to appease the guilty conscience of a Government...I am in complete agreement with the statement of this College's Church (Methodist), that war is the greatest sin of modern times; and as a Christian, I find it necessary, not only to refuse to participate in the sin of warfare, but also to oppose and condemn it with all my vigor. I find the only course to follow is to resign, proceeding to the U.S.A., where freedom of speech and expression have not yet been completely stifled. There I shall continue furthering the cause of peace on earth....I cannot honestly continue missionary work in a country *enslaved* by the *tyranny* of a *self-righteous oligarchy*, without speaking out against that slavery....I detest war in any form and for any reason; and I detest a *Government* that has such *little genuine regard* for the *misery* and *poverty* of these *millions* of Indian people. But I shall never forget India. As long as I live I shall preach the cause of justice in India. But there can be no justice until freedom comes...One of the great bits of propaganda that the British Empire has used in this war was, that, in Germany, the great Universities had been made into tools and puppets of the Government, that there no longer existed academic freedom, that the Germans were intellectual slaves. Here, in India, as everyone knows, we have the C.I.D. which investigates all persons who do not seem to agree with the established authorities. And, in the schools and universities, they, or some other investigating authority, have placed *stool-pigeons*, whose job it is to check up on the teachers, to see if they are teaching anything subversive. What meaner and more despicable way could there be to earn one's living, than posing as a friend or student and then turning over *incriminating evidence* to the authorities? What meaner system exists than that of *spying* on persons whose only crime is that they believe in searching out the truth and then not fearing to speak it? Mr. Buell conducted an *impartial* objective investigation into the nature and *cause* of the *war* in his class-room. He was directing the minds of his pupils toward truth, one that

he hoped would contribute its share in helping to end war on the earth. But there was a stool-pigeon in his room, who turned over abstract quotations from his discourse to Government. This search for truth must stop—says the Government. Yes, somewhere, someone is afraid of truth'...."

"In his last chapel talk to the students, Mr. Becker said: 'Let there be no doubt in the minds of the other nations what India wants and believes. Some leaders in the Christian Church, as well as those who hold India in political bondage, are among those who are afraid of the truth. You should search for truth, regardless of consequences... Today, we Christians know... that war is an *abysmal folly*, that war is the *greatest collective sin* of modern man. The Church knows this, too, and has preached peace on earth and goodwill to men since the first century. But, says the Church, *let us fight for our religion which teaches us not to fight*. Your great Indian leader, now resting in jail by the due processes of a fake democratic justice, Jawaharlal Nehru, writes at the top of the editorial column of *The National Herald*: Freedom is in peril, defend it with all your might. It is said that the British in Europe are quoting that statement as proof that India is in favor of the present war, misquoting Nehru as meaning that we should all fight against Germany. But you and I know what Nehru means—freedom, freedom for India... Before you can accomplish anything, you must regain the lost privilege, without which all mankind lives in slavery, the right of *freedom of speech*. This has been taken away from you because, somewhere, someone is afraid of Truth. And the Truth alone will set you free'...."

The other splendid statement, 21-10-1941, by Mahatma Gandhi, (*National Herald*, 23-10-1941), every word of which is indisputable, deals with "the Government Communique on Jaiprakash Narain's alleged correspondence".

The *Leader* (Allahabad), 17-10-1941, published this:—

"The following communique, d/-16-10-1941, has been issued by the Home department, Government of India:—

'Plans to consolidate the position of the Congress Socialist Party, by winning over important members of the terrorist organisations known as the Revolutionary Socialist party and the Hindustan Republican Socialist Association, and by isolating the Communist Party, were seized from Mr. Jaiprakash Narain, security prisoner, class I, Deoli camp, when he attempted to pass them to his wife, Prabhavati

Devi, at an interview. If only to attract the youth of India, Mr. Jaiprakash Narain urges in these papers the formation of an under-ground wing of the Congress Socialist party, which will acquire funds by the *old method*; he describes this wing as an—illegal party designed to engage in illegal activities.

‘Mr. Jai Prakash Narain emphasizes the political need for a clear distinction between the Anglo-German and the Russo-German war. Our attitude should be, he says, ‘that we sympathise fully with Russia, but are helpless to do anything about it; at the same time our opposition to Britain’s war and our national struggle should continue, and all our class movements.

‘The documents reveal a programme of secret and avowedly illegal revolutionary activity. A Kisan struggle in a selected area, in contrast with the *farce of Satyagraha*, is strongly advocated.

‘Incidentally the papers throw interesting light on conditions in the Deoli camp and the manner in which *grievances* are manufactured or exploited’.....”

Then followed long extracts of “relevant passages from the documents seized”. In these extracts, such names, of different parties, working in India, occur as these: the Congress Socialists, the Communists, the Terrorists, the Punjab Kirti Kisan party, (which a note in square brackets, by the Government, explains as Sikh Communists), Revolutionary Socialist Party, Hindustan Socialist Republican Association, Punjab Communist League, Forward Bloc, Congress Socialist Party [Forward Bloc], Anushilan or Revolutionary Socialist Party.

Mahatma-ji writes, (*National Herald*, 23-10-1941): “*Assuming the correctness of the charge against Jaiprakash Narain...the method advocated by him is against the policy of truth and non-violence adopted by the Congress, and he deserves the severest condemnation. But it ill becomes the Government to condemn or discredit it. Frankly, all nationalist forces, no matter by what name they are described, are at war with the Government, and, according to accepted canons of war, the method adopted by J. Narain is perfectly legitimate. Jaiprakash has had his training in America for seven long years, and is a student of the methods adopted by western nations in their fight for freedom. To practise deception, to resort to secret methods, and even to plot murder, are all honorable, and turn the perpetrators into national heroes. Are*

not Clive and Warren Hastings British heroes ? If Jaiprakash Narain was in the British diplomatic service, and by secret diplomacy achieved something of importance, he would be covered with distinction. The sensation with which the event has been disclosed to the Indian world is ill-conceived. The annotations in the communique are probably wholly unwarranted. When it is borne in mind that Jaiprakash Narain is an untried detainee, the annotations look very like hitting below the belt. The Government should have shown Jaiprakash the document or documents seized, and published his answer, if he had any to give..."

Mahatma-ji then goes on to condemn strongly the manner in which the Deoli camp is worked, and says : "Prisoners of war are treated like princes compared to political prisoners." Incidentally, it would be illuminating, if the British Government in India published figures of the expenses incurred on the Italian prisoners now kept in India, and also stated who is paying the bill, the British Government in and of Britain, or the British Government in and of India, miscalled the Government of India.

Mahatmaji concludes with some wise advice to Jaiprakash Narain : "While Jaiprakash Narain remains the patriot we have known him, Congressmen must realise that his method is harmful in the extreme, while a non-violent struggle is going on...*Secrecy* has no place in a *non-violent* organisation. No underhand or underground movement can ever become a mass movement, on stir millions to mass action. I am glad that the Secretary of the Socialist Party (within the Congress) has repudiated the method said to be advocated by Mr. J. Narain...I would appeal to J. Narain to reconsider his philosophy...and, if his reason can approve, to repudiate the method as a lapse of sound reason and of the loyalty he owes to the Congress. What he has stigmatised as a *farce of Satyagraha* is not a farce...Jaiprakash did not, indeed, go to prison as a Satyāgrahī ; but he has not ceased to be a member of the Congress; and so it is not proper for him and others who think with him to retard the movement by their action, which is admittedly disloyal to the Congress."

It only remains to add, with reference to the words, "Assuming the correctness...", with which Mahatma-ji's statement begins, that a communication d/- 22-10-1941, from a correspondent, from Wardha, published in the *Hindustan Times*, 24-10-1941, invests the proceedings of the Government

with some mystery. It says: "The statement contained in the communiqué issued by the Government of India, that the 'plans were seized from Mr. Jaiprakash Narain when he attempted to pass them to his wife at an interview', is extremely misleading...It is alleged that the plans are believed to have been recovered from Mr. Jaiprakash Narain's pocket by persons who evidently acted on previous information. The Government's motive in publishing the documents continues to cause mystification in Congress circles here; more particularly since the papers were seized nearly *three months ago*. Their publication cannot and does not discredit the Congress, since Mr. Jaiprakash Narain had never really made a secret of his views."

Then the correspondent gives his own views as to the nature of the papers seized, which "reveal no concrete plan of action,.. and merely represent the rambling ideas of one who is thinking aloud;" surmises and discusses various 'diplomatic' motives for the Government's proceedings, and, referring to Mr. Amery's "campaign to educate Americans about India", concludes thus; "But *Americans* may quite conceivably, refuse to despise India and Mr. Jaiprakash Narain for the views he holds, and *would almost certainly regard the documents as indicating the seething discontent in India.*"

Why cannot, when will, the Scientists, the Philosophers, the Educators, the Legislators, the Leaders, the Statesmen, of all these countries and nations, which pride themselves on their very highly advanced intelligence and civilisation—why cannot, when will, they see that the way to allay all such *seething discontent*, which is by no means wholly confined to India, to-day, is—*not Repression, nor false promises and evasive diplomatic words and devices, but Education and Persuasion* of the Nations, the Peoples, of all the countries, into a body-satisfying Rational Social Structure, an Equitable World Order, and a soul-satisfying Rational World Religion!

"The chance that reason will prevail in an *unequal* society is necessarily small;...In the presence of passion, people become blind to truth; they see what they want to see...In war-time, any plea for reasonableness is at a discount...Men think antagonistically who live differently... The success of the Puritan Rebellion and the American Revolution was built upon the fact that, in each case, the *exercise of power* had been a *habit* of the *general population*;...and, in each case, a blind government confronted

men who knew how to formulate their wants ;" (Laski, *Liberty in the Modern State*, pp. 173-180).

Compare the condition of the Congress, which has not yet 'formulated its wants' precisely, has not outlined any 'particular form of Social Organisation' to maintain.

"The success of the British Constitution in the nineteenth century, and the general success of representative government, was built upon an *agreement between parties* in the State, upon *fundamental* principles;" (183). But so long as one party insists upon 'equality', and interprets it as 'utter and complete equality'; and another party insists upon 'inequality', and interprets it as 'illimitable inequality'; so long there is absolutely no hope of any such agreement. Let the one party replace 'equality' by 'equity' or 'equitability'; and the other replace 'illimitable' by 'specifically limited'; in respect of income; and there is *every hope*, that the needed agreement will be arrived at quickly. Even Plato, revising, in his *Laws*, "the complete communism which had distinguished his Utopia", of his *Republic*—which, by the way, makes a hash of the principles of the fourfold-class-and-life-stage-system of India, of which Plato seems to have heard confused accounts¹—says that "no member

¹He says: "Until philosophers are kings, or the kings and princes of this world have the spirit and power" (better say, guidance) "of philosophers, and political wisdom and greatness" (better say, power) "meet in one, cities will never have rest from their evils...nor the human race...If, in the countless ages of the past, or *at the present hour, in some foreign clime which is far away* and beyond our ken, the perfected philosopher is, or has been, or shall be compelled by a superior power to have the charge of the State,...there this our constitution, has been, and is, and shall be"; (*Republic*, by Jowett, pub. 1888, pp. 170-1, 198). The *foreign clime* seems to be the same, India, which Plato's grand-pupil, Aristotle's pupil, Alexander, attempted to invade, without success, many decades after Plato's death. The traditions of *ancient* (not medieval, nor modern) India are fairly well-known to orientalist scholars; traditions of kings like Janaka, who gave instruction in the deepest and highest Philosophy and Psychology of Vedānta, to seekers of the Spiritual Wisdom, and of R̥shis who periodically visited, supervised, cross-examined, catechised, the younger kings, not yet perfect in the philosophy and psychology and in the science and art of Good-Self-Government.

of his State should possess property more than *four times* in amount of that owned by the poorest citizens"; (177). What the difference should be, has to be settled by sympathetic consultation, with reference to the peculiarities and circumstances of each people and country. 'Four times' is too little. The type, 'man of trade, business, farming', 'man of the commercial professions', will crave more; other types will be content with even less. 'Wealth', in the sense of 'money', is *not* the main or greatest incentive for all types. Some desire *honor* more; some, *power* (of official authority) more; some, play, amusement, *circenses*, more. Of course, *panem*, necessities, and a minimum of comforts (which vary, as indeed do necessities also, to a smaller extent, for the different types), ought to be ensured to all.

"Where depth of feeling was passionate—Irish Home Rule—events moved rapidly to the test of the sword; and the settlement made was effected by violence and not by reason. That was the essence of the Russian problem"; (183)... "Successful Government is simply Government which satisfies the largest possible area of Demand", (185); in Mill's philosophical phraseology, approaches nearest the achievement of 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number'; in other politico-economical writer's words, 'secures the widest spread of general welfare', 'performs its promotive or ministrant functions most diligently'.

"The policy of censorship, during the war, meant that every one, anxious for its *prosecution* to the end, had ample opportunity to express his view; the pacifist, the Christian, *the believer in peace by negotiation*, found it extraordinarily *difficult to speak*"; (186)

"I do not want to be taken as implying that violence is the inevitable end. I only argue that the irrefutable and inherent logic of a *society* where the *gain* of living is *not proportioned* to its *toil*, is one of which *violence* is the *inevitable end*. We have never any choice in history except to follow *reason* wholly, or, ultimately, to expect *disaster*... But, human nature being (as yet) what it is", i.e., egoism dominating altruism, instead of the other way, "men do not easily surrender what they have the power to retain;" (192-193). "No principle has been more fruitful of war than the demand for *National* freedom... There is something *exclusive* about *Nationality*... a sense of *separateness*, a feeling of *difference*, of *uniqueness*, which makes *domination by*

others so unpleasant as to even justly involve resistance... But the fact remains that *Nationality* is a *psychological* phenomenon, rather than a juridical principle. It is in the former, not the latter, sphere, that we must seek to meet its claims... You have only to remember the acts which, during the war, States attempted against one another amid the applause of their subjects, to realise that the recognition of *National unity as a State* means the *destruction of Private Liberty* and the violation of International Justice, *unless* we can find means of setting some *limit to the powers* of which a Nation-State can dispose;" (193-195).

Pt. Wilson created the League of Nations for this very purpose of setting such limit; but was circumvented and thwarted by Messrs. Lloyd George and Clemenceau and the inheritors of their policy.

Mr. Laski, in the above, implicitly confesses that the 'uniqueness' which he insists on so much in connection with the 'individual', and of which, 'national uniqueness' is only a 'psychological' magnification, needs everywhere to be *subordinated, reasonably*, (not to the extent of extinction), to the 'universality' of the Human 'Social'.

To see the 'psychological', 'subjective', 'mental' nature of 'individuality' as well as 'nationality', consider this: I say, *I am Jones, or Jacques, or Fritz, or Ho-lung, or Kuroki, or Chekov, or Rama*; *my* consciousness and interest are confined to only this particular handful of flesh and bones which is '*my* body'. But now I say, 'I am a Londoner, Parisian, Berliner, Pekingese, Tokyan, Moscowite, Dehlavi'; my consciousness and sympathy expand and include all the hundreds of thousands and millions of '*my* fellow-townsmen', the 'I' becomes a 'We'; 'We Londoners', etc. Again, 'I am an Englishman, or Frenchman, or German, or Chinaman, or Japanese, or Russian, or Indian; there is a still greater magnification and inclusion. 'I am a European, an Asiatic, an American, an African; or a White Man, or a Colored Man; or a Hindu, or a Christian, or a Muslim'; there is a yet greater spread of My-ness, or I-ness, or We-ness. It is only when the leading and the ruling men and women of all nations realise that 'I am a *human* being *first*, and a member of this or that religion, race, nation, etc., in very much the *second* degree'; only then shall the dead League of Nations receive a new influx of Spiritual Vitality, will come to life again, as a Spirituo-Material

Religio-Political League, and will achieve its proper destiny and purpose.

In the meanwhile, "Nationalism becomes Imperialism, and this means the enslavement of lesser nations to the imperialistic power...Even where imperialism has resulted in *measurable benefit* to the *subject* people, as with Great Britain in India, or the United States in the Philippines, the *resultant loss of responsibility and character*, which an imposed rule implies, is a (much too) *heavy price* to pay for the efficiency of administration that has been conferred. The *noble phrase* of Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman, that 'good government is no substitute for self-government', is borne out by every phase of the history of imperialism..The classic case in my own experience is the case of Ireland. I cannot find ground upon which to defend the habits of Britain there", (196); no "English political genius" is to be seen there. The comment needed here is that the "noble phrase" needs the addition that 'bad-self-government (government by bad 'selves', foolishly and knavishly elected, by electioneering tricks)-is no substitute for Good-Self-Government (government by good 'selves', wisely and honestly elected, in upright and aboveboard manner)'. A self-government which is a bad government is not a true self-government at all; it is only a pseudo-self-government. What is wanted is a genuine-Self-government which is also a good government at the same time. Government by 'bad selves' is the real 'other-government', 'foreign government'; government by 'good selves' is the genuine Self-government; whatever the country or the skin-color of the selves. The real 'other', 'foreigner', is the 'lower nature'; the real 'native', the proper 'Self', is the 'higher nature'

As regards India, the benefits indubitably conferred by British rule are, opening for Indians of the way to knowledge of the wonders of western science, literature, archeological and historical research; amenities and enrichments of private and public life, due to printing-press, watch and clock, lamp and lantern, post and telegraph, rail and car, sewing-machine and bicycle, kerosine, electric lighting, watering, fanning; new forms of domestic utensils, new ways and materials of cloth-making, paper-pen-ink-making, umbrellas, house-building, town-planning, road-making; machinery of various useful kinds; establishment of uniform law and order throughout, and thereby a sort of political unification, of the whole country.

Such are the benefits. But, as Laski indicates, the country

has had to pay much *too heavy* a price for them. "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, but lose his soul?" India has lost her soul almost completely and is frantically struggling to recover it. After the soul went, much of the body began going too, and the benefits have been becoming more and more hollow. Population has been allowed to grow beyond all bounds; and grow with masses of diseased, undernourished, indeed half-starved, uneducated, mentally, morally, and physically feeble, human beings, of very poor quality, poor in every sense of the word. The wealth of the country has been drained away. What education there is, has become exceedingly expensive, unsuitable, worse than useless, vocationally, economically, spiritually. Unemployment, of educated as well as uneducated, stalks the land. Herd-education has taken the place of discriminate cultural, vocational and temperamental, training and apprenticeship. Art in domestic paraphernalia has decayed. In schools, colleges, universities, lack of discipline, lack of earnestness, lack of seriousness, excess of flippancy, smartness, high living and plain thinking, cinema-frequenting, and the spirit of that "mockery which is the fume of little hearts" (as Tennyson wrote)—are rampant. "Let knowledge grow from more to more, but more of reverence in us dwell", wrote the same poet; but the spirit of reverence is to be found, only here and there, very rarely, now, even among the educators; therefore much more rarely among the educands. The mercenary, instead of the missionary, spirit prevails. Professors promptly leave one university and go off to another, which offers even slightly better financial prospects. 'Electioneering', intrigues for 'power and pelf', mammonism, 'local politics', are to be seen in many universities and their administrative bodies. Trade, commerce, business, has been demoralised, by brazenly false advertisements and other commercial tricks copied from the west. The grossest advertisements, shamelessly tempting and corrupting, brazenly mendacious and fraudulent, stimulating 'hunger, sex, avarice,' stare out of newspapers, daily, regarding cigars, alcoholic drinks, digestive medicines, aphrodisiacs, semi-nude cinema actresses, lotteries. Law and law-courts, instead of promoting speedy and inexpensive justice, promote ruinous litigation and lying evidence. The top-men of the bars of the High Courts make incomes five or six times as large as those of the High Court judges, and twice as large as the Viceroy's, from their fees, euphoniously or euphuistically or euphemistically called

'honoraria'. On the other hand, thousands of briefless barristers and pleaders sit about, idle, whiling away time anyhow, in the court-buildings. Touting is widespread. The case of the medical and other 'learned' professions is similar; all are excessively over-crowded. Stock-jobbing, speculation, is ruining honest trade. Bogus companies start, and disappear with shareholders' hard-earned savings, week after week. Business has become gambling. Local elective bodies like municipal and district boards, political parties, legislatures, are hot-beds of intrigues and jealousies. The public services are largely corrupt. The administration is top-heavy; a comparatively few hundreds of very heavy-salaried 'officers'; millions of very low-paid subordinates; some three hundred and fifty millions of 'subjects' having an average income of about one anna (one pence) a day. The extremes of high and low salaries and incomes are immensely far apart. The public has become largely de-moralised, lacking in good and strong character. Lack of sympathy, of affection, of cooperation, indeed positive conflict, pervade all aspects of life, domestic and social, private and public. Briefly, India has become demoralised, despiritualised, impoverished, enslaved in body and mind.

Such is the price India has had to pay for the benefits of foreign rule; because the western spirit of Discord and unregulated Competition, and the doom of other-dependence, came in together with those benefits, and the spirit of self-regulation, self-control, self-reliance, self-dependence, self-reverence, all went out. Let it be said again that the primary cause, the root-cause, of all this coming in and going out, is the *Degeneration of Character*; first, of India's religious and political leaders, and then of India's People generally, even *before the advent of the British*; very many evils of all sorts, domestic, social, political, economical, religious, had been already growing, for centuries before; the forms were different. Japan received the benefits of modern science and civilisation, and *did not* pay *such price* as India has paid, because they came to her *without political domination* by the west; which domination was prevented by the heroic, patriotic, self-sacrificing Character of the Japanese People as a whole. In India, the political domination began first, because of her loss of Character, and of Spirituo-Material Philosophy, and the benefits, with the evils, came afterwards. But Japan too, has taken up many of the evils of the west, now, voluntarily.

"The principle is,...the necessity for *World-Control* where

the decision is of *World-Concern*....Wise solution is possible only in terms of reason...not of passion and power...The choice is between Reason and Conflict...I deny that there is any qualitative difference between the interests or the rights of *States*, and those of other *associations* or *individuals*... Where War begins, freedom ends....The covenant of the League of Nations is a method of limiting the unfettered exercise of *national* sovereign power...The League's history makes hideously manifest" the failure of the League...."*The big states* have *controlled it*...Yet experience of the League gives us hope rather than despair...The vital discovery of our time is that men of different nationalities *can* co-operate together, in the task of International Government, in such a way as to sink the pettiness of a narrow outlook before the greatness of the common task....The idea of a *World-State* is slowly, painfully", (in view of the current World-War, *very* painfully), "hesitantly, taking shape before our eyes;" (198-203).

Laski's last chapter is headed 'Conclusion'; (pp-207-212). So far as definite, specific, constructive ideas are concerned, as to what the fundamentals of the World-State are, his conclusions are very lacking. This has been noted before, (p. 66). There is much that is in common between Laski and Joad, and, in fact, many other prominent thinkers on such subjects. Joad has not said anything expressly about a World-State, as Laski has done once, as above. But all his arguments point ultimately in the same direction. He says, "It is no part of my purpose to indicate in detail...a constructive policy to satisfy the aspirations of the generation now coming to maturity...(but) three indispensable features it must embody...(1) Economic Security and Political Liberty...Unless men can use the liberty which democracy gives them, to resolve the paradox of Poverty-in-Plenty, by discovering a means of *distributing* what science has enabled man to *produce*, the paradox will destroy democracy...(2) Reform of the Instrument of Government...(3) *Education* for citizenship;" (pp. 198-218). Laski stresses these points also. But he sees and says clearly that what is of World-Concern must be brought under World-control, which is possible only with some sort of a World-State; and proper *Distribution* of *Produce* is patently a matter of World-Concern.

The words of that veteran worker in this behalf, H. G. Wells, must be quoted here, in brief, to wind up the discussion,

and show that 'Freedom', Regulated Freedom, 'Liberty', Ordered Liberty, Independence, 'Inter-dependence', is not possible today without a World-State integrated by a World-Religion. The last pages of Mr Wells' book, *The Shape of Things to Come*, left an impression that he was anti-religious generally. But passages like the following, remove that impression wholly, and show clearly that he is only, and very rightly, anti-priestcraft, and a profound believer in, and powerful advocate of, Essential Spiritual Religion.

"The over-riding powers that, hitherto, in the individual soul and in the community, have struggled and prevailed against the ferocious and base impulses that divide us from one another, have been the powers of *Religion* and *Education*... The intellectual and theological conflicts of the 19th century explain...that disentanglement of religious teaching from formal education, which is a distinctive feature of our age...The consequence has been the reversion of International Politics towards a brutal Nationalisation, and the backward drift of industrial and business life towards harsh, selfish, and uncreative profit-seeking...There has been a real *de-civilisation* of men's minds...Presently, *Education* must become again, in *intention* and *spirit*, *Religious*...The impulse to universal service, and to a complete escape from the self,¹ which has been the *common underlying force in all the Great Religions*—an impulse which ebbed so perceptibly during the prosperity, laxity, disillusionment, and scepticism of the last seventy or eighty years—will reappear again, stripped and plain,² as the recognised fundamental structural impulse in human society. *Education* is the *preparation* of the individual for the *community*; and his *Religious training* is the *core* of that preparation...*Essential Identity* is the most important historical aspect of *these Great World Religions*...The white truth in each, burnt free from its dross, becomes manifestly the Same Truth...What all these great World Religions declare by inspiration and insight, History as it grows clearer, and Science as its range extends, display, as a reasonable and *demonstrable*

¹ and ². The ancient Indian thought would say, not 'a complete escape from the self', but 'a reasonable subordination of the lower and smaller self to the Higher and Larger Self'; and not 'stripped and plain', but 'reconciling and synthesising all particular religions'.

fact, that men form one *Universal Brotherhood*, that they spring from *One Common Origin*, that their individual lives, their nations and races, interbreed and blend and go on to merge at last in One Common Human Destiny upon this little Planet amidst the Stars ..The coming *World-State* will be based upon a common *World-Religion*, very much simplified, universalised, better understood....Throughout the world, men's thoughts will be turned by Education, by example and the circle of ideas about them, from the obsession of the self¹ to the cheerful service of Human Knowledge, Human Power, Human Unity. This World-State will be sustained by a Universal Education...(Its) Political Organisation...(and) its Economic Organisation (shall use) electoral methods...and (a) currency...safeguarded or proof against the contrivances and manipulations of clever, dishonest, men...*Private enterprise* will be the *servant*—useful, valued, *well rewarded*—and no longer the robber, of the *Common-weal*; (Well's *Outline of History*, edn: of 1937, pp. 1147-8, 532-3, 1157.)

The Indian National Congress and the Indian People, as well as all other Peoples and all Political Leaders and Political Parties, everywhere, will achieve their Purpose in its best, truest, highest, and most lasting significance, Freedom for all together and for every one, of the finest, most genuine, most all-reconciling, all-satisfying sort, *only when* these Leaders realise the need for, think out the main lines of, and strive conscientiously to achieve and establish, on the firm foundation of an initial genuine British-Indian Commonwealth, such indispensable, mutually integrated, mutually pervasive, World State, or World Federation or World Order *and* World Religion.

CHAPTER XII.

or

APPENDIX A.

THE WORLD'S DIRE NEED.

AN APPEAL TO THE SCIENTISTS OF THE WORLD.

(Some 300 copies of this were posted, in February and March, 1938, to the Vice-Chancellors, Presidents, Heads, of the best known Universities of all lands, and to the Scientists mentioned in the first and second paras. It was also reproduced in many Indian dailies and some monthlies, f.i., *The Indian Theosophist* ; and in the *Theosophist* (Adyar, Madras) which goes to over 50 countries. It was also reproduced in the original English and in translations, in some countries other than India).

SCIENTISTS OF THE WORLD ! UNITE !
HUMANITY HAS EVERYTHING TO LOSE IF YOU DON'T
AND EVERYTHING TO GAIN IF YOU DO !

Seventy-six Delegates of Universities, Learned Societies, Associations, Institutes, and Academies, of Asia, Europe, Africa, America, brought congratulations and good wishes to the Allahabad University, at its Golden Jubilee Convocation, on 13th December, 1937. A humble servant of Humanity had the great pleasure of seeing the delegates and hearing the messages. An idea, which had occurred to him often since 1919, arose in his mind strongly on this occasion, on witnessing the living proof of benevolent sympathy between these great Educational Institutions.

A fortnight later, on 28th December, 1937, at the Convocation of the Benares University, he had the pleasure of seeing some famous scientists of Europe (who had come to India to attend the Indian Science Congress at Calcutta in January, 1938), and of hearing lectures by four of them. The idea recurred more strongly. It is this :—

Disarmament Conferences, held by the Militarists and Diplomats, have failed ignominiously and tragically. So

has the World Economic Conference held by the Capitalists and Economists. *The Scientists should come now to the Rescue of Mankind.*

Let the Universities of all the countries of the world make common cause; let them hold a *Conference of representative Scientists* of all countries, as they can, for Science knows no geographical or political boundaries; let them unanimously and strongly appeal to all the Militarists of all countries, without distinction and exception, to stay their disastrous course; and let them *unitedly think out*, and place before the world, *the best means* of converting the Destroying Satan of Militarism back again into the Protecting Archangel of Humanism. Let the Universities and Scientists do this, and there is a last and very great hope that the imminent Hell of Armageddon may be averted, and Humanity achieve the Heaven of Salvation and Peace and Prosperity.

Let the Chancellors, Vice-Chancellors, Presidents, Principals, Governing Bodies, Professors, and all *the Scientists*, of all the world, leaders in the concrete Physical, Biological, Psychological, Sociological, and also the abstract Mathematical and Metaphysical Sciences, resolutely band themselves together, in a great *League of Humanity*, without distinction of creed, caste, colour, nation, race, or sex, with the one steady unwavering aim of achieving Peace on Earth and Goodwill among Men, and *think out and provide the world with a Technique for making such Peace practicable.*

The dire peril of the Human world is visible to all. The highest-placed statesman, men at the very helms of the affairs of the most powerful nations, burdened with the greatest responsibility for the welfare of their countries, are repeatedly giving utterance to their sense of the Approaching Horror, and are making frantic efforts to keep it at bay. But, because of the radically wrong spirit of *Nationalism* instead of Internationalism, of Territorial Patriotism instead of *Humanism*, which inspires and drives them all, those very efforts are bringing that Horror nearer, instead of pushing it farther away.

The military experts of the U.S.A. recently made a survey, and reported that the *Standing Armies and Reserves* of the Great Powers totalled *fifty-five million men*, and the estimated *annual expenditure* thereon, for the year 1937, was about *thirty-five hundred million pounds.*

It is obvious that the enormous burden of this *vast Mis-employment of Men and Money* (i.e. Human Labor), in prepar-

ing for the infernal work of mutual slaughter and of butchery of innocent civil populations, including women and children—this *body-ruining Economic Burden*, and this *soul-disintegrating Moral Corruption*, due to ever-growing mutual Hate and Fear, cannot be sustained by the nations very much longer. *There must be Disarmament, either by Mutual Agreement, or by Mutual Slaughter, before very long.*¹

Let *Disarmament* be brought about by *Mutual Agreement*, and *Men and Money* be wisely and well employed, under the guidance of self-denying *philanthropic Scientists*, instead of being misemployed as they are now under the direction of self-seeking *misanthropic Capitalists*, *Imperialists*, and *Militarists*, in one *World-wide Organisation for Peace and Prosperity*, instead of many *Nation-wide Organisations* for War and Misery; and the whole of the *Earth's surface* will be made to bloom and blossom and fruit as *one vast farm, orchard, park*. Otherwise, if *Disarmament* takes place by *Mutual Slaughter*, then the probability is, as these statesmen themselves have been saying over and over again, that *Civilisation will perish, and Mankind once more reel back into the Beast*, for long ages.

Those most virulent of all possible toxins, Lust and Hate, Greed and Fear, Pride and Jealousy, which, in the individual, become transformed by excess, into *Eroto-mania* and *Cido-mania*, *Avaritio-mania* and *Phobo-mania*, *Megalo-mania* and *Zelo-mania*, appear, in national masses, as *Sensualism* and *Militarism*, *Capitalism* and *Terrorism*, *Imperialism* and *Nationalism*. These are running riot in the mental, moral, physical, blood and tissues of all the nations to-day, in varying degrees. They are disordering, they are making *In-sane*, the *Psyche* as well as the *Physique* of all Mankind. They were not purged, but made more virulent, by the Great War, and the subsequent Treaties. They are again, at the moment, venting themselves in two terrible open sores, one in the West, in Spain, the other in the East, in China.

All the 'neutral' Great Powers, every one knows, despite diplomatic phrases and pretences about non-intervention, are helping or hindering, directly or indirectly, the one or the other of the active beligerents.

¹The Mutual Slaughter began, with the German invasion of Poland on 1-9-1939, and the Franco-British attack on Germany on 3-9-1939.

These two wars, as also every one knows, while outwardly waged by human beings, with the help of weapons created by Physical Science, are, inwardly and fundamentally, being fought *between two main Ideas*, (rival 'gods', 'titans', 'angels', in mythic terms), both assuming varying and even interchanging shapes ; of Imperialism, Militarism, Capitalism, Fascism, Nazism, on the one hand ; and of Super-Capitalism, State-Socialism, Socialism, Communism, Bolshevism on the other. *The two have several features in common* ; so much so that, one feels that *if they would only shed extremism* in respect of certain other and vital features, *they could unite*, could merge into one, *and become means of promoting human happiness insted of misery*. Indeed, both, as also the parent Idea of *Democratism*, out of which both may be said to have bifurcated, like step-brothers, have done very great things for their own peoples ; while they have all, also, equally indubitably, inflicted great and widespread cruelties and committed extensive crimes.

As it is, nationalist policies and diplomacies are making strange combinations, and the international chess-board shows such new moves and arrangements, and at such short intervals, that it becomes difficult sometimes for laymen to even make out which pieces belong to which side. Thus, in Spain, the Fascists and Nazis seem to be on one side, the Communists on the other, and the Democratists to be helping or hindering both ; while in China, the Communists are openly helping China against Japan, and the Fascists and Nazis (notwithstanding pacts with Japan), as well as the Democratists, seem to be all more or less against Japan, for various reasons (though, by profession, Japan is also Democratist, like Britain), and are all helping China, also, in various ways.

Every great Human Movement has, necessarily, some sort of a Philosophy of Life behind it, conscious or sub-conscious, good or bad, sound or erroneous. Practice is inevitably connected with theory, instinctive or deliberate. The French Revolution is said to have found its philosophers in Voltaire, Montesquieu, Rousseau, and the Encyclopaedists ; the greater Russian Revolution, in Bakunin, Marx, Engels, Lenin, and others. Capitalist Individualism is said to find support in Bentham, Spencer, Darwin, Wallace, and Mill. Fascism and Communism, both, are reported to trace their spiritual ancestry back to the German philosopher Hegel, in different ways ; and they are now warring against each other with the implacable hate

of step-brothers. On the present occasion, we must not endeavour to apportion blame or praise ; but it is unavoidable to say, for our purpose, that *all* those nations, *all* those Powers, without exception or distinction, which have been, are now, or think of, exploiting, subjugating, enslaving, oppressing, any weaker populations, nations, races, or classes—all such are *to blame*, in the degree in which they are thus treating the weaker.

Now, it is obvious that *the Philosophies* behind the gigantic movements, and *also the Science-created Weapons with which they fight*, are within the purview, nay, are the main concern, are even *the creation, of the Men of Thought and Science* ; in fact, it has been said repeatedly, by western writers, that the last World War was much more a war of Scientists than of Soldiers ; and Scientists, to-day, are almost all congregated in the Universities and various Learned and Scientific Institutes. *A very great Responsibility, a very urgent and high Duty, therefore rests upon them ; and an equally great Power and Authority belongs to them, if they would only awaken to it, recognise it, assume it, determine to wield it. They are the Educators of Mankind. They constitute the 'Spiritual Power' to-day. They should guide the 'Temporal power' everywhere, instead of allowing themselves to be mis-guided, exploited, prostituted by it.* They can resolve and declare that they will cease to discover, invent, teach, if the politicians and the soldiers do not cease to misuse the Precious Knowledge. They should Non-Co-Operate with, and offer Civil Dis-obedience and Passive Resistance to, Imperialism and Militarism everywhere, collectively, unitedly. They will be irresistible. Education is the root ; Civilisation is the fruit. As is the one, good or bad, such is the other. Science should compel the Sword, to nourish, vivify, protect ; not the Sword compel Science, to destroy. If Science flings away Spirituality, and clings to Materiality alone, then it makes easy, inevitable, its own prostitution and ultimate destruction by the Sword.

The *Universities* of to-day are the Successors of the Temple-towns, the Cathedral-cities, the Mosque-capitals, of the medieval ages. The custodians of the latter *de-generated* and lost their authority. The members of the former, *the Custodians of Science, should make themselves fully Regenerate, by adding Spiritual Science to Material Science, and constitute themselves into the new and greatest World Church, the Guardian of Humanity, and create and guide*

the new and greatest World State, the great Joint Family of All Humanity.

Most of the leading Scientists, in all branches of Science, have realised, and are now teaching, that Science is for Life; not Life for Science; that Life, Mind, Consciousness, is more and other and greater than Matter; that *the divorce of Physical Science from Humanist Social Science, Morality, Spirituality, Philosophy, is the one cause of the present horrible condition of the mutual relations of the Nations, and of the Classes or Sections within each nation.*¹

Not only Science, but also Art, Literature, Law, Religion and Philosophy, all are for the amelioration and service of Life; not Life for these. The Scientist is more and greater than his Science; the Artist than his Art; the Author than his Book. What is the good of expending marvellous genius and wonderful industry in measuring the distances of the stars, calculating the weight and ascertaining the chemical composition of suns and moons and planets, expounding the mysterious properties of numbers, discovering new metals and gases and forces, extorting the most closely hidden secrets of Nature from Earth, Water, Fire, Air, and Sky, exploring the endless wonders of the Infinite and the Infinitesimal with telescope and microscope, reconstructing thousands of years of utterly forgotten history with the help of stray archeological finds, inventing aeroplanes, submarines, radio-audition, tele-vision, and ever more and more powerful explosives and 'rays'—what is the good of all these? Is this the 'good' that these secrets should be turned into weapons and be utilised for mutual vast mass murder by human beings? "How shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world but lose his own soul"? It were far better not to discover and invent such things at all; or, in any case, to keep them close secrets in the custody of the pure and the philanthropic. Such was the ancient tradition of India.

The ancient injunction is :

"Science (Vidyā) came to the Man of Wisdom, the man of Knowledge and Purity, and said to him : Guard me well, as a sacred trust; give me not to the wicked and sinful, but only to the pure of heart and large of mind ; so only will I be strong to nourish mankind ; otherwise I will only destroy thee and thy pupils and thy people."² If such close guarding of scientific

¹See *the Essential Unity of All Religions*, pp. 19-26 and pp. 569-572, for quotations.

²*Manu*, ch. ii, verse 114.

discoveries is not possible now, (though all sorts of precautions are taken to guard 'military secrets' and 'secret weapons'), then it is all the more necessary to remember, that *it is not enough to make miraculous discoveries in Physical Science, or write learned books on other departments of knowledge, and publish them broadcast. It is necessary to guide and govern all such labors and publications, by the unifying, illuminating, beneficent purpose of promoting world-wide Human Welfare in well-thought-out, well-defined, broadcast ways*; so that there may be every inducement to human beings to use the discoveries righteously and not wrongfully. It is also necessary for Science to strongly control the Sword and the Purse and to nourish the Plough, by means of those ways and by its gathered powers of ascetic soul-force, moral force, and Nature-secrets. Another ancient injunction is: "When the Temporal Power becomes militarist, and attempts to overbear the Spiritual Science Power, then it becomes the duty of the latter to bring the former under control; for the Spiritual Power created the Temporal Power, gave birth and shape to it, and should direct and correct it; as a wise parent, a misbehaving son".¹

The Science which does not do this is not constructive but destructive, and will ultimately destroy itself. Those who create Frankenstein monsters are eaten up by them in the end. The leading Scientists of the West are realising this, and are publicly deploring that "Science has outrun Morals".

One of the foremost biologists of the day says: "*The enormous advance of the Sciences of Inanimate Matter over those of Life... is one of the greatest Catastrophes ever suffered by Humanity. The environment, which science and technology have succeeded in developing for man, does not suit him; because it has been constructed at random, without regard for his true Self... Science follows no Plan. It develops at random... It is not at all actuated by a Desire to Improve the state of human beings... Modern civilisation finds itself in a difficult position, because it does not suit us. It has been erected without any Knowledge of Our real Nature... We are the victims of the backwardness of the Sciences of Life over those of Matter... The only possible remedy for this evil is a much more profound Knowledge of Ourselves. The Science of Man has become the most*

¹Ibid., ch. ix, v. 320.

necessary of all the Sciences”; (Alexis Carrel, *Man, the Unknown*, pp. 34-39 ; edn. of 1937).

The ancient Indian tradition is clear that *all Knowledge should subserve* “the purpose of promoting *Human Happiness Here and Here-after*”, in clearly recognised ways ; and that the Chief of all the Sciences is “the Science of the Self”, “*the Science of Man*”, Philosophy-Psychology, Ātma-vidyā, which *co-ordinates all the Sciences of Matter* as subordinate, and assigns to each its proper place and value *in the service of the Scheme or Plan of Individuo-Social Human Life*. This ancient Indian Scheme of Individuo-Social Organisation of the Human Race is expressly based upon the facts and laws of Human Nature, as manifesting differently in successive periods of the *Single life*, and in different temperaments and vocational aptitudes in the *Collective life*. Most unfortunately, the Philosophy-Psychology, and the application of it to the conducting of human affairs, have both become perverted from their true meaning and observance, for many centuries now, in India, because of the general Degeneration of Character ; and the result has been the manifold enslavement of the people, religious and educational, economic and political, social and industrial.

It is for the *Universities to redeem* that great fall and failure, and re-elevate the character of the People, by the force of their own Good Example and Wise Precept.

Much might have been and was expected from *western Modern Science*, after its battle against, and victory over, the similarly degenerated Church of the West. But, again most unfortunately, that Science too *went astray in a most vital respect*.

Its greatest theoretic discovery is claimed to be that of *Evolution by the law of the “Struggle for Existence”*. A *half-truth*, and therefore not quite true for even the vegetable and animal kingdoms, it is *very untrue for the human kingdom*. The result of accepting it as the whole truth, and obeying it, consciously and unconsciously, has been the *competitive hatred* that we feel all around us, among us, everywhere, *pervading the whole atmosphere of human life*. This misunderstood half-truth of the “Struggle for Existence,” accepted as the only true ‘philosophy of life,’ and followed in human affairs diligently, from the smallest to the largest scales, individual and national, is ever intensifying that Hatred and Discord, in family, farm, factory, school, college, court,

office, transport, all professions whatsoever, and international relations ; necessarily explodes from time to time in *vast Wars*. It has brought about *the Prostitution of Science to the service of the Sword and the Purse, for the Misery of Humanity*, where those two should have obeyed and served Science reverently, for the Welfare of Mankind. *It is driving Mankind*, in East and West alike now, *towards Avernus, and will plunge them into it*, together with all Science and all Scientists, and all the indubitable wonders and glories of modern western civilisation which they have built up, as well as all the equally indubitable cruelties, vices, crimes, of the underground, diplomatic, exploitative, and 'Night' side of its life, and all its ruthless treatment of weaker populations—*unless the Scientists resolve to act before it is too late*. Kropotkin endeavoured to turn the attention of the public, to the complementary and greater half-truth, viz., *Mutual Aid for Existence*, in his book of that name, but in vain.

Darwin too recognised that indiscriminate war would no longer help the Evolution of Man. Struggle, conflict, duality, polarity, is, no doubt, a Law of Nature ; but so also is Alliance, friendship, self-denial, self-restraint, co-operation, synthesis. Man, regarding himself as higher than animal, priding himself on the possession of Reason, fore-sight, far-sight, in-sight, should be able to avoid that maleficent extremist 'species' of Conflict which is War, that *excess* which is the sin of sins, and should diligently confine himself to that beneficent variety of it which is Emulation, Rivalry in the Promotion of General Welfare.

How to check this advancing Horror ; how prevent another and far worse Armageddon ; how ensure World-Peace ; how bring about world-wide Disarmament by Mutual Agreement ; how neutralise and deaden those deadliest, most powerful, most destructive *psychical* explosives, the evil human passions of whole nations, which create the *physical, material*, explosives—this has, therefore, become *the greatest, the acutest, the most Urgent Problem of the day* ?

The Scientists who discover the effective Solution of this Problem, will have made the greatest and most beneficent discovery of the ages, and will win the veneration, nay, the worship, of all Mankind. The Universities, and the greatest, most thoughtful, most philanthropic, Scientists of the time, should bend all their energies to this greatest of all tasks, putting aside all others, till this is successfully accomplished.

Humanity is in imminent danger of dying from mutual hatred, born of lack of equitable distribution of sufficient Bread—Bread Spiritual as well as Bread Material ; born of lack of adjustment between Individual Needs and Social Needs. Man cannot live by Material Bread alone ; his whole being craves and cries out for genuine Spiritual Bread too. Also, man is neither merely 'Individual', nor merely 'Social' ; he is both ; "no one lives or dies unto himself alone", as the Scriptures say ; the requirements of both 'Individualism' and 'Socialism' 'exclusive Antipathy and inclusive Sympathy', 'Egoism and Altruism', are ineradicably inherent in each person ; hence the unavoidable need for rational adjustment, reasonable satisfaction, of the impulses, appetites, instincts, of both kinds.

The Universities should supply the 'Spiritual' Bread directly to all Mankind ; and should point out, to all, the practical Way in which a sufficiency of 'Material' Bread can be supplied to each person.

False formalist Religion is, no doubt, "opiate for the people," as the Socialists say ; but True Spiritual Philosophical Religion is the very Elixir of Life. So long as human beings fear death and pain, so long will they inevitably need the consolations of such True Religion. If they cannot get True Religion, they will seek refuge in False Religion.

The new Russia seems to be discovering that fact freshly, and recognising it suitably. *Let that True Religion be re-discovered and taught by selfless Scientists now, since the professional priests have lost it. The most thoughtful Scientists of the West are coming to believe in the Essential Fact at the Heart of this True Religion, viz., the Fact of the All-pervading Spirit, the Anima Mundi, the Intellectus Mundi, even the Corpus Mundi, the Collective Intelligence, the Supra-Conscious, the Universal Mind, the Total All, "in which all things live and move and have their being, and which lives and moves and has Its Being in all things," the Mystery which has created and runs this Universe, from inconceivably small atoms to unimaginably vast star-systems. The Great Design, a recently published book, is a symposium by fifteen leading scientists of international fame, belonging to different branches of science, in which they all confess their faith in this Spiritual Intelligence which reigns and rules over the World of Matter.*

By deep research into the Nature of this *Supreme*

Universal Spirit, this Universal Mind, as manifesting in the *individual spirit* and mind, will be discovered the components of the healthy *Spiritual Bread* which Humanity needs, in the first place. In the second place, by the due application of the laws and facts of Psychology and Physiology, of human mind and human body, thus discovered, there will also be discovered the just way, the *Correct Technique*, to make an *Equitable Distribution* of the world's Work and Wealth, of necessities and comforts and luxuries, of labour and leisure and pleasure; the Right Way which alone can neutralise the deadly explosives of human jealousies and hatreds; the correct Technique of a satisfactory, complete, and *comprehensive Individuo-Social Organisation of Humanity*, which will reconcile all the demands of Individualism as well as Socialism, by giving to each human instinct and appetite, selfish and unselfish, (and both are inherent in human nature), and also to each temperament and vocational aptitude with its special requirements, its due, and not more than due; the Technique, the Right Way, which will make practicable, and ensure, the service of "Each for All and All for Each".

There is one such systematic Scheme of Socio-individual Organisation already in existence, as indicated before. It is made up of four subordinate, interlinked, interdependent organisations, Educational, Political (or Protective or Defensive or Executive), Economic, and Industrial. It was framed by the ancient Sages and Seers of India, who had discovered the greater, nobler, and for Humanity the far more useful complementary half-truth and fact of *Human Evolution in accordance with the great 'Law of Alliance for Existence'*, in contradistinction from the animal half-truth of Evolution by 'Struggle for Existence'; that law of Alliance, nay, of Self-Denial, of which every good family is patent example, and *the mother in each family* (even in the rapacious carnivorous feline or lupine family) most pre-eminently. That Scheme is the only one consciously attempted, and actually worked, in the known History of Mankind, until the year 1917; except perhaps that which was operated, between the 12th and 15th centuries A.D., in the kingdom of Peru, destroyed by the Spaniards. But it has obviously degenerated utterly, and become a curse instead of a blessing. Yet it is creaking along somehow, even after three, or four, perhaps even five, thousand years of fair and foul weather and all sorts of storms and stresses; perhaps because it still has some elements of truth left in it.

But if it has become effete and even harmful, all the more necessary is it that a new one should be thought out by the Scientists.

The vast Russian experiment, in progress since 1917, is the second effort of mankind in the same direction ; but, while it has achieved marvels, it has also committed many serious and cruel mistakes, is still undergoing great internal tribulations, and is correcting its errors by what looks very like a reversion, in many respects, to the right middle course, between impossibly equalitarian Communism and criminally in-equit-ous Capitalism, such as are advocated by so-called Reformism. The leading Scientists and Thinkers of Russia, as much as those of Germany and Italy, as well as of France, Britain, U. S. A., and also of Spain, China, and Japan, and other countries, should most certainly and insistently be invited to share in the deliberations of a *great Congress of Representatives of all branches of Science*, branches of the one tree of the Science of Life, for the mitigating, and then the healthy finishing, of the travail-agony of all Mankind, *for the formulation of a new and complete Scheme of Social Structure*, (of course not rigid, by any means, but allowing ample room for national variations in details, *within* the limits of great and firm general principles); for the ushering in of a true Millennium of a world-wide International Alliance and Co-operation for Existence, in place of Struggle and Competition ; for the bringing to birth of the Federation of the World, the Organisation of World-Peace and World-Prosperity, inspired, en-liv-ened, ensouled, by World Religion.

Conclusion.

The men and women who combine in themselves Science and Learning, as well as Philanthropy and Self-Denial, are the only true possessors of Wisdom, in all countries, in all races. *Wisdom is Science plus Philanthropy.* Neither Knowledge, however great, nor philanthropy, however deep, constitutes Wisdom by itself. The *Universities* and *Learned Bodies* of the World should be, and presumably are, staffed and conducted by *such Men and Women of Wisdom*. In them should reign, if anywhere, from them *should radiate*, if from anywhere, *Philanthropic Benevolence and also Knowledge of the Way to bring Happiness to Humanity*. They have, therefore, the Right, the Duty, and the *Moral Force, the Authority, and the Responsibility*, to advise and guide the human world. The Scientists have created the marvels of Modern Civilisation;

they must save it from annihilation; otherwise, the dreadful Sin will be theirs, as much as the splendid Merit is now.

They should teach to the World, the best Way to Peace by means of the best form of Social Organisation, in accordance with the Law of Alliance for Existence, (governing and regulating the working of the inferior Law of Struggle, and utilising it as subordinate and servant)—the Way which would satisfy all the appetites, needs, requirements, of all temperaments, sexes, ages, within the limits of Reason and Mutual Justness, Mutual Ad-just-ment. Indeed it is obvious that if every one cared only a little more for others, and a little less for himself, all would be happy; whereas, where every one cares much more for himself and as against all others, all must be unhappy. But a proper Technique is indispensable, as to how to care for both self and others, but a little more for others and a little less for oneself, systematically, in the Political, Economic, and Industrial spheres, and how to Educate all accordingly and suitably.

Marx and Engels cried: "Workers of the World! unite! for you have nothing to lose but your chains!" But they did not say that the uniting should be like that of head, arms, trunk, and legs, like that of knowledge, action, desire, and plasmic vitality, like that of the nervous, muscular, glandulo-vascular, and skeletal systems, in a single psycho-physical organism, a human individual. The result is only vaster discord. Therefore, Humanity now cries:

"SCIENTISTS OF THE WORLD! UNITE! AND SHOW US THE RIGHT WAY; FOR HUMANITY HAS EVERYTHING TO LOSE, IT PERISHES, IF YOU DON'T; BUT IF YOU DO, IT IS SAVED, IT LIVES, IT FINDS PEACE AND HAPPINESS FOR ALL."

A humble Servant of Humanity.
30th January, 1938.

The following forms a helpful supplement to the above Appeal. The portions within quotation marks are taken (slightly abridged, here and there) from the *Hindustan Times* of the 28th and 29th Sep., 1941; the rest are comments by this writer.

"The British Association held a three days' Conference at which World Scientists gathered. Sir Richard Gregory, Chairman, said at the opening session, on 26-9-1941: 'The

anguish which the world is suffering today, is due to the *perverted use of knowledge and the rejection of all high ideals by cultivated barbarity.*' He said that '*the delegates represent the Common Purpose of the Men of Science to take an active part in the Construction of a New Framework of Civilisation, in which the full services of their discoveries will be made available to improve conditions of life.*' Prof. J. D. Bernal, of Birkbeck College, said that '*the whole tendency is for Science to take a more positive part, and not to be content with a purely consultative role. Already in Russia, it is one of the key features, in building a Planned, Classless, Society.* The experience of the war shows that *we need a System of that sort here, and that it can work.*' Mr. P. W. Kuo, Chinese Vice-Minister of Finance, said, on the same occasion, that '*after four years of war, China's educational institutions have grown in quantity and improved in quality. For the time being, China is predominantly an agricultural country, and her natural resources are more or less undeveloped. Scientific methods will enable her to multiply the raw material she possesses in great quantities (? quantities), and share it with the rest of the world. This will not be possible if she is dominated over by one aggressive power to the exclusion of others'...*;" as is the case with India, we may note.

While the speeches of the Scientists breathe the right humanist and cosmopolitan spirit, the message of Mr. Churchill was set, in the political key, to the War-aim of *Victory and destruction of Hitlerism as the most desirable aim of all Science.* "Mr. Churchill ... of our objects in fighting this war, is to maintain the right of free discussion and the interchange of ideas'..." witness India! "...In contrast to the intellectual darkness which is descending on Germany, the freedom our Scientists enjoy is a valuable weapon to us for superiority in scientific developement, and is a vital factor in the preparation of *Victory.* The presence of *representatives of so many nations* is a striking proof of that *universal desire for liberty of thought*, which all the power of the Gestapo will never entirely swamp out. It will take a long time for the civilised powers to repair the trail of material and moral havoc which the Germans leave behind them'..." and which would have been prevented, if such a Conference had been arranged—with French, German, Italian, Japanese, Indian, and other Scientists included—four or five years

earlier, and if the Scientists of the World had united in time, and counselled, and compelled by threat of Mass Non-Co-Operation against them, if necessary, the statesmen of the nations, British and French *as much as* German and Italian, to behave rationally, sanely, humanely. "...It will require all the resources of science. But I look forward to the day when *Scientists of every nation can devote all their energies to the common task*..." This 'common task' is left unspecified, unless he meant 'repair of the havoc' etc.; and that *repair* might mean only restoration of the *status quo ante* 1-9-1939, with British Imperialism untouched, with the Pax Britannica, not Pax Humanica, over-shadowing all, and without any *real* Reconstruction of Society, such as Sir R. Gregory and Prof. Bernal envisaged!

"Mr. Eden...welcoming, at a Council lunch in London, on Thursday, 25-9-1941, the delegates to the British Association Meeting on *Science and World Order*, which opened today 26-9-1941, dwelt mostly on the urgent need that '*Hitler's regime and its conception of a Master Race and subject races ...must be overthrown*'..." Has the conception been overthrown by the British Government in India? "...So at present your work is *destined to be dedicated to the destruction of this regime*...The advent of the *machine* has brought astonishing material *advantages* to the many, but has led to *inequalities*, to *much selfishness*, to *unfair division*, and to *materialism*. *If, after the war*, we are going to have any chance to battle with these things, *Science and State-craft must work together*. You will help us, and guide us, and if there is any contribution we can make, you know, we will be only too happy to make it'..."

After the War; and then too, subject to an *if*; and, yet more, Science must work *together* with, i.e., in accord with the will, of what?—of *State-craft*.

'We are all wise *after the event*'; so Mr. Eden proposes to become wise *after the war*; not before that time; not *now*. In the meanwhile, he utters the usual political claptrap, and makes clear his view that the World's Scientists must be yoked to the triumphal car of *Victory* for Britain; not to the Peace-and-Progress Chariot of Humanity. Such claptrap, old politicians always have 'on tap'; Mr. Lloyd George was, and Mr. Churchill is, past master of it; witness the latter's magniloquent speech, explaining his eight-point Agreement with Pt. Roosevelt, glorified by being christened

as 'the Atlantic Charter', in which Agreement the expression "All Nations", and its equivalents, "All peoples", "All men of all lands", occur five times, and his subsequent exclusion of India from the "All". If Mr. Eden and his chief, Mr. Churchill, and his colleagues, the 'Laborite' and other Ministers, would become *sincerely wise, even now*—"it is never too late to mend"—and ask a Scientists' Conference to *appeal* to the Scientists of France, Italy, Germany, Russia, Japan, and U.S.A. also, to join with them in calling a halt to this Mad War of Power-snatchers and Victory-cravers, *each of whom* says that the other is a Menace to Civilisation and that it alone is striving for the Freedom of the World; and if all the Scientists jointly insist on the belligerents calling a Truce and proclaiming an Armistice, and giving these Scientists the chance, *now*—which Mr. Eden vaguely hopes for, with a doubtful 'if', *after* the war—of drawing up a Rational Scheme "to battle with these things"; if this were done, then, though the British Government, i.e., the present Cabinet, may be deprived of a Roman Triumph, yet the British People and all the other Peoples of the Earth would be saved much further groaning, and would obtain peace and great happiness forthwith.

"M. Maisky, the Soviet Ambassador to London, presiding over the Saturday (27-9-1941) Session, which discussed *Science and World Planning*,...said: 'I think the problem of *large-scale Planning in International Affairs* will become acute soon *after* the war is over...The day will undoubtedly come when a *system of very Comprehensive Planning*,...economic, social, political,...would embrace the *Whole Globe*; but the day is not very near'...;" obviously, since the Demented Ones are determined, for the time, to smash each other's heads rather than put them together in rational consultation. "...I come from a country where *Planning* is the *very Foundation* of the *Economic life*. It took more than twenty years to build up the present system of Planning, although, since the early days of *our Revolution*, we had not had to reckon with *difficulties* originating from the existence of *Private Property in the means of Production and Distribution*.'" M. Maisky, probably said this with an invisible smile, because the *difficulties* were there, in Russia, and very plentifully too, all right enough, but were *made non-est* by that very same "our Revolution" itself. "He went on to say: 'How much more difficult it will be to bring about *Economic*

Planning on a World Scale! It is obvious that this is not a matter for today or even tomorrow...If Hitlerite Germany wins this war, there will be no freedom, no culture, no science, no planning in the world; there will only be one huge prison'..." In the non-German countries of the world, he must have meant, for, certainly, there is and will be no lack of science, culture, and planning, etc., in Germany itself. If there is a lack of 'freedom' in Germany *during* the war, Britain and Russia are not very much better off. In the present circumstances of the war, M. Maisky could not but conclude on the note set by Messrs. Churchill and Eden. But people may well think that if Russia had not rushed in to swallow half of Poland, and a substantial part of Finland, and the whole of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and had kept to her policy of internal peace and external neutrality, she would have been, today, in a position to bring about *Peace between the other Belligerents*, and teach them her own "system of very Comprehensive Planning". Instead, she finds herself involved in a ferociously murderous war with Germany, and is threatened with attack by Japan also. Incidentally, it may be noted that Mr. Louis Fischer's conclusions have been falsified, and those of Mr. Pritt justified, by the very unexpected diversion of Germany's attentions from the west to the east; see pp. 108-9, *supra*; though, as other British writers, even military experts, have written, there was much friendly interchange of military science between Germany and Russia, during the years that Hitler was "secretly (?) re-arming Germany", and there was an overt mutual non-aggression pact also. But, there is 'no honesty, no scruples, in politics and war'; grossly selfish opportunism, very short-sighted withal, reigns. 'God's mills grind slowly but surely', however. 'As ye do, so *shall* it be done unto you; therefore, 'Do as you would be done by'. The mere fact, that the Russian Soviet's Ambassador is entertained with all honor in Britain, and is requested to preside over a session of a World Scientists' Conference, met together to discuss the vitally important problem of 'Science and World Order'; and says to the Conference what he did say; this fact, occurring too in imperialist Mr. Churchill's regime, is, by itself, full of hope for Mankind. Because Russia is fighting Britain's battle, and saving her from disaster, she is beginning now, in Sept.-Oct., 1941, to be called an 'ally', instead of merely 'co-belligerent', as in June-July, 1941, by the British Premier and

other Ministers. If out of this meeting together of Russia and Britain, the co-belligerency against Germany should really grow into a sincere co-operancy against World Disorder, and should mature into a genuine alliance and mergence of the *two* as yet discordant *Idealogies*, of Capitalist-Imperialist-Individualism and Communist-Autocratist-Individualism, into *one* concordant harmonious Idealogy of Individuo-Socialism, somewhat like the old Indian, and a real New World Order—then, indeed, there would be rejoicing all over the earth, and Mankind would be able to say “Out of Evil Cometh Good ; out of War, Peace”.

It has been said, on p. 441, *supra*, that the human heart craves the consolations of Religion ineradicably, and will seek refuge in false superstitious religion if it cannot find true Spiritual Religion ; and that the new Russia seems to be discovering that fact freshly and recognising it suitably. Perhaps the last three words had better be replaced by the words ‘tolerating it patiently’. The following extract from another speech by Mr. Maisky will explain. The speech was intended to satisfy U.S. American critics of Russia’s reputed anti-religious policy.

“M. Maisky, the Soviet Ambassador, speaking in London...proceeded to deal with the subject of Religion in Russia. He said : The Soviet Union considers that religion is a private matter for each citizen. Despite what is thought by many, religion in my country is not persecuted, every citizen having the right to believe or not to believe according to his or her own conscience. Article 124 of the Stalin Constitution reads : ‘In order to ensure the citizen’s freedom of conscience the Church in Soviet Russia is separated from the State and the School from the Church. Freedom of religious working and freedom of anti-religious propaganda is recognised for all citizens’. In 1940, in Soviet Russia, there were over 30,000 independent religious communities of every kind, over 8,000 Churches, and about 60,000 priests and ministers ;” the *Mahratta* (Poona), 26-9-1941.

Incidentally, what can ‘thirty thousand independent religious communities’ mean ? So many sects ? Scarcely. If the figures of Mr. Maisky are correct, then, by themselves, they prove a newly found tolerance and patience on the part of the Soviet Government ; but do not indicate far and deep seeing wisdom in dealing with religion. Wise administration requires that, no doubt, particular sectarian creeds should be

suffered, even indulged, so long as they do not make war on one another and break the peace ; but, at the same time, diligent effort should be made, through the Educational Organisation, to disseminate and inculcate the basic, fundamental, essential teachings, (1) intellectual, (2) ethico-emotional or devotional, and (3) practical or actional, which are *common* to all the great religions. It was for the Churches of the Great Religions to do so. But, as said before, they have all degenerated ; have become 'professions', means of livelihood, living by 'competition and conflict' ; and where 'interest' comes in, 'dis-interested philanthropy' goes out. As Havelock Ellis observed, and as many others, century after century, have done, the Churches have become tools of the States, "mere cogs in the war-making machine" ; *Impressions and Comments*, (pub : 1921 ; entry d/- 2-10-1919).

CHAPTER XIII.

or

APPENDIX B.

Mr. H. G. Wells' 'Declaration of Rights'; and Comments thereon.

The *Picture Post*¹ for 4th, 11th, and 18th May, 1940, published, in three instalments, an article, 'Unite—or Perish', by Mr. H. G. Wells; (see p. 41, *supra*). At the end of the second instalment was a note: 'Copyright by H. G. Wells; translation rights reserved'. The copyright seems to have been waived subsequently; for the article has been published, since then, in the *Nation* (New York), and been reproduced in some Indian papers, from the *Nation*, in February, 1941. Instead of being copyrighted, such very useful, thought-stimulating, instructive writing ought to be broadcast throughout every country, for the education of Public Opinion.

Cuttings from the *Picture Post* came into this writer's hands, in the last week of August, 1940. In the first part of the second instalment, Mr. Wells says, in a parenthesis, "Remember, this is a debate, and the columns of the *Picture Post* will be wide open to you". Accordingly, this writer sent a letter, of criticisms and suggestions, to the editor, on 31-8-1940. It was received back, in Benares, on 26-2-1941, with a printed note from the editor, regretting inability to use it. The post-marks showed that the editor's note was posted, in London, on 19-11-1940. It took three months and a quarter on the way. The war had upset the mail arrangements.

The substance of the criticisms and suggestions is given below, in somewhat expanded form; after abridged extracts from Mr. Wells' article, and comments thereon; without which they would not be intelligible.

"The article sets down, compactly and plainly, the constructive ideas contained in my recent book, *The New World Order*; in order to provoke another such open debate as followed upon the publication of a summary of my *Fate of*

¹Hulton's National Weekly, 43-44, Shoe Lane, London, E. C., 4.

Homo Sapiens.”¹ Then it describes the gloomy conditions of the World. “Not only in Britain, but all over Europe, a progressive disorganisation is plainly apparent; day by day we see things getting worse, education being disorganised and demoralised, the standard of living sinking, freedom dwindling. The first question to put to ourselves is: Is it possible to get any peace now, a peace that will allow us to disarm? The politicians, like Mr. Lloyd George and Lord Beaverbrook, who have been *advocating* a peace settlement, will all reply: No, we must keep armed to the teeth.”

“Next, let us ask: What is the real nature of this strange New War which we are so incapable of ending in any effective way? There is a fantastic variety of views as to what is happening. It is constantly repeated that this is a ‘war of ideologies’. You hear about the Totalitarian State, National-Socialism, Bolshevism. *But do any of these States really exist at all?* If any such elaborate state organisation were a living reality, it would consist almost entirely of people who have definite place in it; who have specific jobs; know they are safe if they do their jobs properly, are sure in their actions as cog-wheels in a watch, know clearly how they stand to one another, how this wonderful new organised State, in which they live, stands towards the rest of the world. Nowhere on earth to-day do any such things exist. Those who talk about ‘a war of ideologies’ are talking nonsense; are talking about fantasies infinitely remote from the grim realities”.

The criticism may be made here that Mr. Wells overlooks, for the moment, in the heat of his argument, the distinction between an ‘ideology’ (better spelt ‘idealogy’) which is, even obviously, an ‘ideal’, and the ‘reality’ which is only the gradual realisation, (more and more close, but never possible to *complete*), of that ‘ideal’. He proceeds:

“Bolshevism, I admit, did at one time seem to contain the promise of a system of constructive ideas. Twenty years ago, when I had the privilege of talking to Lenin, I found that

¹The article may be said to summarise also another fine little book by Mr. Wells, *viz.*, *What are we to do with our Lives?* It came into this writer’s hands after he had sent to the press, the extracts from Mr. Wells’ *Outline of History*, at pp. 430-1, *supra*. It also says some very useful things about what the *spirit* of the New World Religion should be.

fine, valiant, and subtle intelligence entangled in the vast beard of Karl Marx, and doing its best to struggle out of that huge fuzz, to real constructiveness...I have described the talk I had with him, in *Russia in the Shadows*, and I foretold clearly the devastating danger of Marxian *planlessness* and dogmatism. 'Come again', said Lenin, 'in ten years' time'. Six years ago I did go to see what was happening in Russia, and had the privilege of talking to Stalin. I had just come from America. The New Deal was being crippled there, for want of a competent civil service...I found in Russia, no development of any securely ordered society, any real social structure. In certain material particulars, Russia had progressed with the rest of the world, but not nearly so fast, and chiefly by importing American notions, tractors, and so forth. The only organisation that had developed, was the *secret police* and personal espionage. Russia was no more a new social order in 1934 than it had been in 1920. It was plainly relapsing into autocracy..."

"In Germany, so far from any State, new order, or National-Socialism, having triumphed over the individual,... the truth is that forcible and entirely irresponsible individuals have captured the State...and, as in Russia (according to Trotsky), so in Germany (according to Sir Nevile Henderson), are running amok in a steadily disintegrating community".

The comment suggests itself, that there is some one-sidedness, some exaggeration, in these remarks. Trotsky and Henderson could not be wholly impartial critics, situated as they were, when they wrote. Mr. Wells himself, later on, in the article, acknowledges the great things that have been done in Russia, side by side with failures in other respects. Germany's, as Russia's, astounding development in strength and organisation during a few short years, is patent. If the Organisation has been for *War* rather than, or at least as much as, for *Peace*, the fault is not wholly theirs, but, in great part, their neighbours' too, who have been menacing Russia; as, it must be admitted, Russia has been menacing them. The outstanding vice of Germany's 'ideology' is hatefully extremist 'racialism' and racist arrogance, which are most dangerous for other peoples, and necessarily arouse acute antagonism; though, it must be said, other nations have been guilty of the same also, at other times, and are not at all free from the taint, by any means, even now. The all-vitiating lack of the strong

foundations of sound psychological principles, is common to both Germany and Russia, and also to Britain and other so-called Democratic countries, as repeatedly pointed out before.

Wells goes on to say: "That is the essential difficulty of our situation. There is nothing in Germany to make peace with. You cannot make peace with disorder. Disaster, gang tyrannies, a collapse into a brigand world; that is what we fight *against*. And now let us ask, what are we fighting *for*? I ask, what is *our* reality on *our* side? *We*, who are fighting against these gangs and *groups of individuals* who are *professing* to be *new social systems*—are *we* (in and of Britain) so very *different*?"

In vigorous, pungent, trenchant sentences and paragraphs, which seem impossible to rebut, he criticises the attitude, utterances, behaviour of the British Government. "Our present Minister for Foreign Affairs, Lord Halifax, lends his name to the assertion, in a Government publication, *The British Case*, that we are fighting, not simply for the British Empire throughout the world, but for the Christian religion... This *canting stuff* is far below even the Liberal British Imperialism of the nineteenth century... Yet we fight, and with a sense of rightness. *What is it, then, that we fight for?* Most of us will agree that we are fighting for something very much greater than any Empire, something we may all agree in speaking of as *Democratic Civilisation*. We feel that we have a reality in that, a reality that justifies our appeal to World Opinion, against our antagonists. Manifestly since we are, all in conflict, willy-nilly, *it is of fundamental importance that we should have a clear idea of what this Democratic Civilisation is. Have we got such an idea defined?* If not, then, *if we are to get to clear-headed co-operation, we have to get on to that definition now.*" Here, it should be emphatically brought to the notice of the reader, that the whole of the present book is but one long plea for just this very thing, viz. the *defining of what we want*, the getting a *clear idea* of it, as the only way to secure real *co-operation and unity and peace* between the conflicting political and religio-political parties of India. The problem is the same for the I. N. Congress and the other political parties of India, as for the European and far-eastern belligerents.

Mr. Wells says: "You encounter the most diverse statements about this Democratic Civilisation of ours. And the curious thing is that all these diverse ideas have a certain

plausibility; have factors of truth in them; though none of them is the whole truth." This is not curious at all. Indeed it is a very general fact. Nothing, no idea, that ever enters any head, is wholly without *some* truth in it. 'There are two sides to every question'. British Democratism has some good, some truth, in it; so has German Nazism; so has Russian Bolshevism; so has even Italian Fascism. It is only Extremism that has only Error and no Truth in it; though, perhaps, even here, we may have to admit that Extremism too has a *use*, as counterblast to, and check upon, Extremism of the opposite kind. Let the leaders of the nations only realise this utter-true fact, this indisputable truth, in their practice; let them say, not 'I *only*, my opinion *only*', but 'You *also*, your view *also*', and the murderous Conflict caused by the Illusion-Māyā of 'separatism', of 'essential unique individuality', will disappear; and the healthful Co-operative Emulation in good work resulting from the Permanent Reality of the Universal Self, Common to all, will be left behind.

Mr. Wells winds up his powerful indictment of the conditions in Britain, thus: "All the hysterical 'trust and loyalty'¹ to the Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill) and Lord Halifax;

¹The words 'loyalty' and 'allegiance' have undergone the same perversion of meaning, as 'auto-matic', (which means 'self-moving' and also 'mechanical'), auto-crazy, etc. When Congress members entered the Central Legislature of India in 1935, and took the formal 'oath of allegiance' to 'the sovereign and his successors' etc., they were twitted, personally, and in the papers. The present writer explained, in the *Hindustan Times* and other papers, that 'loyalty' and 'allegiance', both, come from the same root as 'law', and mean 'lawful behaviour'. They do *not* mean 'my country, my sovereign, my king, my leader, right or wrong', or 'my king or leader is always right, never wrong'; they do *not* mean supporting him or her in whims, caprices, follies, blunders, vices, sins, crimes, tyrannies, oppressions. They mean only 'helping and supporting him in all *law*-ful activity, giving him *law*-ful counsel, and *restraining* him strongly from all unlawful actions'. The old Indian books contain many express statements and 'historical' or 'legendary' instances to this effect. Not to speak of the earlier well-known cases in British, French, and other histories, the very recent case of the 'allegiance' and 'loyalty' that Mr. (now Earl) Baldwin and the Archbishop of Canterbury displayed in

all the systematic suffocation of discussion; all the lack of confidence in truth and in the spirit of our people, that is manifest now, *is psychologically different only in degree from what is happening in Germany.* The Germans adhere to Hitler because they fear complete chaos if his gang breaks; and if, on our side, Western Civilisation has not yet broken down so completely, it is breaking down; and the present *paralysis of opposition, the same fear* of what may happen if you express yourself clearly, *exists here*, in a less exaggerated form. *Both countries* are slipping down to suppression and violence. *We are a stage or so behind Germany in our social dissolution*; we still live closer to the memory of liberty; *but we follow the same downward path."*

Then he says: "Here I come to something *still more fundamental*, about which, all men of good will, ought to come to a common understanding..."

"A complete biological revolution has happened to our species. There has, in the past half century, been a complete reversal of conditions under which human beings have to live. A tremendous development of invention and discovery has swung us round, in less than half a century, from need to possible abundance, and from remoteness to unavoidable contact..."

"This abolition of distance has made every national sovereign state too small for contemporary conditions... There has been an incredible increase in power and productive capacity... We could have a world of *universal prosperity, if we had peace.* That was not true half a century ago. There has been a tremendous release of energy; and the present political, social, and economic organisation of the world gives no scope for its utilisation, except in destructive violence and war. It is not only mechanical energy that is set free, but human energy of a most urgently restless type, in the form

compelling King Edward VIII to abdicate; this case amply shows the interpretation that the British themselves put upon the words. Yet more: the word 'sovereign' does not necessarily mean a particular person; 'States' are 'sovereign' now; and the 'successors' of a personal 'king' or 'emperor' may, by a constitution-changing revolution, peaceful or violent, be a republic and a president. Also, loyalty must be mutual; the sovereign must be as loyal to the people as these to him.

of great numbers of restless unemployed young men. These supply the driving force for the Hooligan, Nazist, Fascist, Communist, I. R. A. movements that are everywhere *tearing our social order to pieces*; and until we find a way out of this incessant revolt and conflict, a way that will turn this human energy into creative channels, matters will go on from bad to worse. We have to adapt ourselves to these new conditions—or perish. *If we do not end war, war will end us...* Our business exploitation today is a wastage of resources that can never be replaced."

"Coal, oil, forests are being destroyed on a vast scale. Valuable species of animals are being exterminated. Millions of acres of grassland is being turned into dusty deserts. *Unregulated* competitive business is doing all this. *We have power* and more power, and everywhere it is being used to *knock our world to pieces*. That is why it is urgent now to replace, not only our Sovereign States, but also our competitive and wasteful economic exploitations, by a more highly organised method—or perish. To achieve a progressive world-organisation as speedily as possible, is therefore the primary problem. We have to achieve the reorganisation of the world as one continually progressive political, social, economic, and educational community, and embark upon the realisation of the abundance and ever fuller life for man that is now attainable. Am I right in that? Or *have you some other end* in mind, about which I know nothing? If so, *will you tell me what* that end is? Can you set up the universal peace and plenty that is now clearly possible on earth, in any other way?"

"You can have a *Revolution* without massacre or violence. ...*Organised World-Peace and Welfare* mean such a Revolution in human life as will dwarf all previous revolutions to comparative insignificance...But any one who runs about demanding permanent World Peace, and is not prepared to *scrap* his own government and *amalgamate* the general control of political and social life *into a World System*, is either muddle-headed, or insincere, or both. This means the *end* of the *British Empire* quite as much as the end of *German Imperialism*. You have to face it..."

"At the present time, there is a choice of three roles for every one. Either (1) a World-Revolutionary, working to set up a new Law and Order in the World; (2) or a gangster-trickster; (3) or a victim. You must either (1) fight, or

or (2) cheat, or (3) yield...We propose to make the establishment of a *New World Order*, the *major interest* in our lives."

Then Mr. Wells discusses various proposals regarding what is called "Federation", and points out cogently how all such "would simply divide the world up into antagonistic 'bloes' and prepare for a new *more monstrous cycle of warfare*, Europe against America, Yellow against White, directly the unequal *pressure of population* and economic necessity began to operate...Released from its early associations, and stripped down to its essential significance, cleaned and defined, this word, 'Federation', may yet prove the key word for the solution we are seeking. But 'Federation' is one thing; 'Federal Union' as it is now being used, is something much more limited".

"Some writers make much of the *menace* of Bolshevism. As I have pointed out, Bolshevism as the organised, progressive, development of a new type of Society, is not to be found now on earth. It has done great things; it has destroyed speculation; has liquidated illiteracy; has effaced the spirit of serfdom. (But it has now) lost its moral impetus. It has ceased to operate even as a hope..."

"All over the world now, people are distressed about the future, the near future, of our social life—as they well may be. In Great Britain, this Federal Union Stuff is the cheapest dope available."

"Let us leave these fantasies and come down to practical politics...One necessity in the process is *clear statement* in the broadest acceptable terms, *of the world as reasonable people want to have it now*. A great number of people have come to realise the need of a *clear formulation of creative liberal thought*...Following a time-honored precedent of all the free parliamentary nations in the world. after a discussion, ably organised, a *Declaration of the Rights of Man* has been drawn up by a distinguished Committee, presided over by Lord Sankey. It does state, I believe, the greatest common measure of human good-will at the present time. It has been made *acceptable* to the professors of almost any form of *religious belief or none*: It is indeed frankly socialistic and *cosmopolitan*...I fail to see...how any one who desires World Peace and happiness, whatever his or her religion or race may be, can fail to subscribe to it."

"Let us now consider *what we mean* really by political *democracy*. The essential difference between democratic and

absolute rule is this—that, in a *Democracy*, a revolutionary movement need *not* be the *violent* insurgent *upheaval* it necessarily becomes under an Absolutism...The existence of an 'Opposition' is the fundamental political distinction of democracies...It has come into existence only in the last few hundred years, (?), while a bullying authoritarianism is as old as mankind. It is a government with a political revolution incorporated in an opposition, and this opposition is a body which exists to criticise, mitigate, or replace the prevailing regime. It is the very essence of Democracy. It is a two-sided system. *It has taken Revolution into its bosom.* In a genuine Democracy, the opposition stands prepared to get rid of the existing regime, and to change the domestic or foreign policy of the government without limit. It affords a method by which power can be readjusted without killing or cruelty, by stages if necessary, and with every sort of mitigation to the abdicating order."

The following observations come into the mind in this connection. There is much truth, no doubt, in these views of Mr. Wells; the views of Joad, before quoted, and of others, are similar; and Mr. Wells' characterisation of Democracy, as carrying 'Opposition within its bosom', is excellent and illuminative, in many ways. Yet the virtue of this feature tends to atrophy; because the 'Government' and the 'Opposition' usually harden into two irreconcilably antagonistic Parties, each with its own extremist views utterly opposed to the other's, each with its own authoritarian Party-Conscience, which over-rides dissenting and pricking individual consciences within the Party. Really free consultative Discussion disappears. First, Controversy, then stubborn Wrangling, takes its place. The spirit of 'Debate' (*de*, down, and *bateo*, to beat) comes to prevail. The main object of 'the one Party becomes, 'to continue in power'; and of the other, 'to get into power. Each Party, all the time, is so busy endeavouring just to get, or keep, the other Party out, and itself in, that neither has any time, energy, inclination, to soberly, seriously, earnestly, think out any real, substantial, far-sighted measures, promoting General Welfare. Tinkering haphazard legislation goes on incessantly, making petty, paltry, changes, by which one Party or the other gains an inch here or loses an inch there, in a continual tug of war, while the steady and calm flow of the life of the people is disturbed daily in an unpleasant and irritating manner by these changes. It all becomes a perpetual

struggle between two permanently and irreconcilably opposed 'views', 'interests', 'classes', 'nations', 'States', 'ideologies,' *within* a single nation and State; a continual fight between two oligarchies; one actual, in power, the other, potential, seeking power. Witness the condition of the so-called Democracies of Britain, France, U.S.A. They are all brazen 'oligarchies', as Mr. Wells himself, and many other thoughtful writers, recognise and deplore. The mischief becomes the more acute, when a Democracy combines executive with legislative power, as in the case of the British Cabinet.

The better alternative seems to be, to keep the Legislative and the Executive functions, the functions of (1) law-making and (2) law-enforcing, separate; the latter to be performed by persons who are predominantly 'men of action', of 'executive ability'; and the former to be entrusted to persons of mature age, ripe experience, severally representing 'the four main functions of Society', thoughtful, far-seeing, selected and elected by the four vocational social classes or guilds, retired (with exceptions made for special reasons) from 'competitive bread-winning', so that their mood and outlook has become predominantly and disinterestedly philanthropic, instead of prevailingly interested and self-seeking. If such separation is made of Executive and Legislative functions; and if the Legislature is constituted of a body of persons who represent—not only 'the *two* antagonistic nations within each nation', 'patrician and plebeian', 'classes and masses', 'touchables and untouchables', 'rich and poor', 'haves and have-nots', 'oppressors and oppressed', 'capitalist and proletarian', 'aristocrat and democrat', 'conservative party and radical party', but—all the *four* natural and inevitable 'estates of every civilised realm', the four 'parts', 'parties', 'members', 'head, arms, trunk, legs', of every organic Body-politic, the four functions of every complete Society, the four *inter*-dependent, inter-linked, inter-working, non-antagonistic, antagonistic, inseparable (1) Directive (2) Regulative (3) Nutritive (4) Sustentative sub-systems¹ within each living Organic System; if we establish such a Legislature, then the work, which is very badly done, or not done at all, by the Two-Party Democratic System, amidst the acutely unhealthy setting of endless Controversial Strife and Wrangling Bitterness—all that work,

¹The naming and numbering here are somewhat different from Herbert Spencer's.

and much more, will be done much better, in a vitality-promoting atmosphere of friendly, sympathetic, philanthropic Consultation and Discussion of all the *pros* and all the *cons* of every proposed measure, for the *General Welfare*; not of any particular 'business-interest' or 'profession-interest', but of all interests in just proportion to each other; with survey and discussion of many more pros and cons, which would be thought out by 'men of Spirituo-Material Science', than would occur to persons having one or the other of only *two* antagonised, narrow, special, *parti-san* 'interests'. Such a Legislature, which thinks out all the various sides of every question, soberly, calmly, scientifically; motivated by no personal motive, but only by the motive of General Welfare; and then advises, guides, directs and corrects the Executive and the People; such a Legislature would be what may well be called a Source of Permanent or Perpetual and Progressful 'Revolution'. It would keep the Wheel of the Administration of the Affairs of the People, the Wheel of the Life of the People, 'revolving' smoothly, correctly, progressively, on the Path of Upward Evolution always. Instead of using the anti-pathetic words 'Government' and 'Opposition', we would then use the sympathetic Words 'Administration' and 'Guidance'; instead of two opposed and ever-quarrelling Parties, we would have only One Party, which would include all the four Parties which cover and exhaust all the possible Parties of every normal Society or self-contained Community.

See how Truth and Error, Good and Evil, Angel and Satan, are separated by only a hair's-breadth; and how extremes meet. Russia, Italy, Germany, India, each is ruled by One Party only; but that Party is specifically Communist, Fascist, Nazist, British Capitalist-Imperialist; and each has abolished or keeps only a nominal Parliament; so that, instead of *including* all other Parties, it plainly, or practically, by indirect, or underhand and unlawful ways, suppresses, or ignores, all other Parties; and each is focussed in a Dictator, Stalin, Mussolini, Hitler, Viceroy. Such One Party is the very reverse and inverse of the One Party we desiderate. *Demon est Deus inversus*. Error is the inverted image, the false imitation, of Truth; as the reflection of a person standing on a mirror; the feet are at the top and the head at the bottom, the left side has become the right and the right the left.

Wells then makes some very useful suggestions on the important practical question of how to get to work, to realise

our ideal. The whole of this present book makes the same suggestions to the I. N. Congress and other religio-political bodies of India, to the Indian People generally, and to all other Peoples and persons concerned. To appreciate Mr. Wells' suggestions duly, we must bear in mind that he emphatically and repeatedly says: "The existence of an Opposition is the fundamental distinction of Democracies"; "In a *genuine* democracy, the Opposition stands prepared to get rid of the existing regime, and to change the domestic or foreign policy of the Government without limit"; "A democracy is a government with a Potential Revolution incorporated in an Opposition". This is the essence of the "English political genius" which Joad speaks of. Let us listen now, to Mr. Wells' practical and very sound suggestion.

"Link all the liberal-spirited Oppositions in the world, by their acceptance of this *common Declaration of Rights* that has now been framed, and mould their antagonisms to the various warring national governments they face, into the *One Common Pattern* of World Peace and a revolutionary *World Reconstruction*. We have *no need* for a *new revolutionary party*. We do not want to multiply parties. We want to consolidate them. We want to fuse them by a *Common Idea*—'Accept the Declaration'. We need a *World Movement to use the Declaration*..Everywhere, in the Democratic Countries, we have the *instrument* and the *institutional material* needed for a rapid fusion of commonsense men and common people into one creative World Opposition...Governments and Foreign Offices, though reluctant to abolish themselves, yet faced by this intelligent and critical Opposition, will yield this and yield that, *step by step*—provided they are not attacked directly by proposals of self-extinction...*Step by step* they will yield, still clinging to the forms of power and resisting as they go. *Step by step* they will cease to be 'the powers that be', and will become dignitaries and honorable traditions. They need never be overthrown in melodramatic fashion; they may fade out". Later on, he says that "In the non-democratic countries, of course", which may obdurately disallow and prevent the *growth* into being, and growth into strength, of such 'consolidated Opposition' and powerful Associations voicing views contrary to the ruling power's, the movement "*may definitely have to be an insurrectionary movement*".

Then he goes on to say, "The idea of a Federal World

does not involve the creation of a common World Government resembling the sovereign governments of the present time, pushing them aside and taking their place like a conqueror. *It does not threaten* in the least the *racial and cultural distinctions* of mankind. Our imaginations are too obsessed by the United States of America, and we all have horrid dreams of a World President and a Senate and a Lower House of Mankind". And here we come upon a snag, a serious stumbling-block, in Mr. Wells' argument. He goes on to say, "But it is quite possible to anticipate a World Transport Control, Air, Shipping, and Rail included, a World-Production Control, a World-System of Barter, a World-Control of Hygiene, Education and Information, *without* anything you call a *Central Government* at all...For some people that will prove a hard saying. *Somewhere*, they feel, there must be a powerful person, or body of persons which will decide, 'Do this', 'Do that'. Yet there is *something infantile* about that. *Authority* may be *necessary* in what one might call *matter of opinion*. But is a World Transport System, proper distribution of staple products, the health of the race, the common peace, the issue of money, the survey and mapping of the world, or scientific and general education, really a matter of opinion? Is there not, *if only we know it*, a *right thing to do* in these matters? I suggest that, with every increment of knowledge in the world, it is *less and less necessary* for an *over-riding government* to do the *ruling*...Faced with famine or pestilence...an *educated community*...does the right thing to do—without any *masters*."

This writer must confess that he is sufficiently "infantile" (though, as a fact he is only two years younger than Mr. Wells !) to feel that a deciding, perhaps even enforcing, Authority is indispensable somewhere. Here there is a distinctly weak point in Mr. Wells' thesis. He has spoken of economic, political, social, and educational organisation and community. He has not made clear whether the 'political' organisation should or should not include police and military, for the preservation of what is called 'internal peace and law and order' within each country or community. If he believes that such 'military' or 'police', 'civic guards' or 'vigilantes', 'territorial militia' or 'volunteer corps', or however else they may be named, will not be necessary, then he goes against all psychology and metaphysics.

If the present writer is so unfortunate as to err in thinking

so, he errs in good company at least. Mr. Bertrand Russell is also 'infantile' enough, (though only six years younger than Mr. Wells), to believe that a Central Authority is necessary. His excellent little book, *Roads to Freedom*, is analysed and discussed fairly fully at pp. 184-209 of this writer's *Ancient vs. Modern Scientific Socialism*, and contacts have been pointed out there, between Mr. Russell's thought and the Indian traditional thought. Mr. Russell outlines and criticises (1) Socialism, (2) Anarchism, (3) Syndicalism, (4) Guild Socialism. Incidentally, it may be said that there is much in common between all these 'isms', and that one has to keep very wide-awake to subtle differences, if he is to avoid feeling that they are 'twins' or rather 'quadruplets' instead of step-brothers. Mr. Russell says clearly that "What Modern Society needs is *not* a little *tinkering* here and there, not the kind of minor adjustments to which the existing holders of power may readily consent, but a fundamental *Reconstruction*¹ ..The *best practicable*

¹ Wells' *What are we to do with our Lives?* brings out this point fully. This is what Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru has realised and brought out in his article, vide pp 327-8, *supra*.

Ch. xvi of Mr. Wells' book is, in particular, a devastating onslaught on those who "smiling gently, ask whether there is not something preposterously ambitious in looking at the problem of life as one whole; whether it is not wiser to concentrate our forces on more *practicable* things, to attempt one thing at a time, not antagonise the whole order of established things, not put too great a strain upon people, but to trust to the growing common sense of the world to adjust this or that line of progress to the general scheme of things?" The staring glaring answer to these smiling, superior, self-complacent, reforming and tinkering, *practicalist* worthies, is the present condition of the world and this infernal War; the nature and consequences of which are described in the opening paragraph of this book. This ch. xvi, and other pages of the book, repeatedly, lay very great stress, *very rightly*, upon the urgent need to *reduce* the '*quantity*' and *improve* the '*quality*' of the *population* of the earth. If human beings multiply like cats and dogs and fishes, they will be of similar quality and will undergo the same fate. A world-wide movement has grown within the last two or three decades, in favor of restraint of indiscriminate population, and of sex-education; and State-action too has begun to be

system, to my mind, is that of *Guild Socialism*". As Russell describes it, it is, on the one hand, very like Mr. Wells' (what we may call) Control Socialism or System of Controls; and on the other, it approximates to the Indian System, which may well be described as a Four-Guild System. Then he criticises "Syndicalism which aims at abolishing the State"; Marxian Socialism-Communism too hopes that 'the State will wither away', and "pure Anarchism" also wishes to "dispense altogether with a Central Authority". Mr. Russell says, "Syndicalism would, I believe, find itself forced to reconstruct a Central Authority in order to put an end to rivalries of different groups of producers"; and "Guild Socialists are dissatisfied with the old State Socialism, but they are unable to accept the Anarchist (i.e. 'no archon') view that Society can dispense altogether with a Central Authority. Theft, crimes of violence, of jealousy, rape, cruelty to children, and so forth, are almost certain to occur in any Society to some extent; also attempts by the ambitious to subvert the Anarchist regime by force"; in short, perversions and excesses of the primal egoistic instincts; and "we have every reason to think that the power which the State derives from the criminal law cannot be entirely abolished, though it can be exercised in a wholly different spirit, without vindictiveness..."; (*Roads to Freedom*, pp. 12-13, 123-136). The arguments which have been advanced before, to show that M. Gandhi's saintly wish to abolish Violence from the world, or at least the human world, is impossible to realise, apply here also.

taken, in many countries, in accord with that movement. In his fine essays on 'The Individual and the Race' (*Little Essays of Love and Virtue*, pub. 1922), and 'The Function of Taboos' (*More Essays of Love and Virtue*, pub. 1931); Havelock Ellis—the benevolent and courageous pioneer-initiator of the scientific and public study of Sex, in the west, and re-discoverer, for that west, of the ancient *Kāma-Shāstra*, the Science of Sex-Love, with his great book, *The Psychology of Sex*, in seven large volumes—in these little essays, H. Ellis has stated the case for such restraint and such education excellently, for popular information. In the first essay, he insists that the Socialist must be a Eugenist also; in the second, he says that "Education in matters of Sex is now being more or less systematically carried on in all countries (of Europe)". In India it is unknown, now, thanks to the government.

The pathological and psychiatric branch of Psychology tells us that all sorts of evil tendencies are ever present in the Sub-Conscious deeps of *every* mind; and that if the 'inhibitive' will, the 'controlling' power, weakens, they rush up and out in the form of manias; as the criminal inhabitants of the 'under-worlds', when the police weaken. Metaphysic and general psychology tell us that the seeds of all possible Virtues as well as of all possible Vices, are always present in each one of us, and striving to sprout and come to the surface; when the Vices find a favorable 'season' and opportunity, and prevail, the individual becomes an 'evil person'; when the Virtues, a 'good person'. In the 'In-divis-ible All', the One Self, all Virtues and all Vices are present in full bloom, synchronously, 'eternally', beyond Time, Space, and (their manifestor) Motion. In the 'in-divid-ual each', the multi-tudinous selves, they manifest 'successively'. The 'In-divis-ible All' is the same as the 'in-divid-ual each'; and yet different also. The latter is the exact, but inversed and reversed, reflection of the former, in the Looking-glass of Māyā, Illusory no-thing-ness. "God made Man in His own Image" (by Imagination). The Infinite is the infinitesimal. Extremes meet, again.

Mr Wells asks: "Is there not, *if* only we know it, a right thing to do in such matters?" But the *if* constitutes just the difficulty. There *will* arise occasions when there will be differences of *opinion*, when *all* persons concerned will *not know* equally clearly, when some will be in doubt and some in serious opposition. A final Authority will be needed to decide. He says, "that with every increment of knowledge, it is less and less necessary for an *over-riding government* to do the ruling", and that "faced with famine or pestilence...an *educated community* ..does the right thing to do ..without any *masters*". Most unfortunately, vast 'increment of knowledge'—scientific—has only brought these terrible wars, as Mr. Wells himself deploras, instead of a 'lesser necessity for overriding government'. This means that something more than mere 'increment of (scientific) knowledge' is needed, even in the most 'educated community'.

Even with the best and most widespread spirituo-material, psycho-physical, religio-scientific education, there will still remain, always, the possibility of lawless 'rebellions' of even 'educated opinion', and rebellions in the shape of even violent outbreaks. The spirit of self-assertion, *opinion*-ated arrogance, turbulent ambition, the craving for superiority and command

over others, in short, all sorts of disorderliness, will continue to 'run amuck' in this or that individual or group, from time to time, unavoidably.¹ Egoistic instincts are as ineradicable as altruistic; though both are regulatable and adjustable, by Right Education, *provided* Education is *supported* by Legislation and Administration; not otherwise. *Excess* of *either* kind of instinct is harmful—it should be remembered. And to curb, regulate, divert and direct them into useful channels, and suppress occasional outbreaks when they do occur, some Authority, some residual Compulsive Force, will always be needed, in the last resort. There is 'war in heaven' even, between rival 'angels'.

As has been well remarked, pithily and humorously, but also with deep truth, by a western writer: 'Every new generation is a fresh invasion of savages'. The very root and basis of human life is Appetites, Impulses, Passions, Desires, Urges, very selfish, thoughtless, 'savage', that need to be perpetually restrained, guided, refined—from *within*, by Education, primarily; but also by Legislation (through 'the best and wisest' of the community) and Executive action, (through honest police), from *without*, secondarily. The best governments are those that govern least; the best governed, those that are governed from *within*, and require least to be governed from *without*; but *some* external 'government' will always be needed. In the expressions which Mr. Wells himself uses frequently, e.g., *Control* of the Drug Traffic, *Control* of the White (better say Sex) Slave traffic, Shipping *Control*, General Transport *Control*—the very word *Control* implies the need for, and the existence and availability of, some 'compulsive force', some Controlling Power, some active Authority, somewhere.

In any case, by Mr. Wells' own admission, a final deciding "Authority is necessary in matter of *Opinion*"; therefore, when differences of *opinion* arise within a single 'Control' (Board), or between several 'Controls', of different departments, *'whether to do this, or do this other thing'*, 'which is the right course to follow', 'how best can co-ordination of the work of different Controls be effected', a Central Authority becomes indispensable.

¹See the extract from Ford's *Representative Government*, in *The Ethico-Psychological Crux in Political Science and Art*, pp. 2-4.

The fact is, as Mr. Wells himself candidly admits, now and again, that his own thought on this point is fluid, not yet clearly settled. Thus, in *What are we to do with our Lives?* (p. 42), he writes: "The present rudimentary development of *Collective Psychology* obliges us to be *vague and provisional* about the way in which the Collective Mind may best define its will for the purpose of administrative action. We may know that a thing is possible, and still be unable to do it as yet; just as we knew that aviation was possible, in 1900. Some *method of decision* there must certainly be, and a definite *administrative machinery*. But it *may* turn out to be a much slighter, less elaborate, organisation, than a consideration of existing methods might lead us to imagine. It *may never* become an *interlocking system*. We *may* have Systems of World Control, *rather than* a single World State. The practical regulations, enforcements, and officials needed to keep the world in good health, for example, *may be* only very *loosely related* to the system of Controls that will maintain its communications in a state of efficiency..".

The old Indian thought on the subject is to the effect that 'Collective Psychology' is not radically different from 'Individual Psychology', any more than 'Collective Physiology' is from 'Individual Physiology'. Obviously there are differences between individuals, in their psyches as well as physiques. But there are enough resemblances, analogies, uniformities, to make 'generalisations' and 'sciences' of psychology and physiology possible. Also the elemental basic facts of Metaphysic and Psychology are, so that thought indicates, as certain as those of Mathematics; e.g., the three functions of the mind, cognition (knowing), desire (emotion), action (conation, volition), and a plasmic fourth or consciousness in general—though there may be various views, even disputes, as to which terms are most suitable and expressive to designate them; and, for further example, the four parts of the body head, trunk, arms, legs, with four broadly different functions. The possibility—'*may never* become interlocking'—is like the possibility—'*the four functions of the mind, the four parts of the body, may never* become inter-related; *may* all be cut away from each other, and live independently'. The words '*may be* only very loosely related', show the weakness in Mr. Wells' thought here. 'Loosely', as much as you please; but *related* they must be. That weakness is further shown by the fact that only two pages further on, at p. 44 of his book, he slips into

the words, 'World State', 'World Directorate', again and again; on p. 59, he speaks of a '*Central Bureau of Intelligence*'; on pp. 70-71, he speaks of the present "dense world of *un-co-ordinated activities*", of "*the selection and organisation of these heterogeneous and mainly religious impulses upon which we rest our hopes of a greater life for mankind*", and of planning "*a system of co-ordinated activities*". Again, on pp. 111-112, he writes, "the anticipatory repudiation of military service, so far as this last may be imposed by existing governments in their factitious international rivalries, need *not* necessarily involve a *denial* of the need of *military action* on behalf of the World Commonwealth for the *suppression of national brigandage, nor need it prevent the military training of Open Conspirators*". Finally, on pp. 113-114, he enunciates "seven broad principles defining the Open Conspiracy and holding it together"—a sort of first sketch of his later 'Declaration of Rights'; and the sixth of these is "...the creation of a *World Directorate* capable of these tasks...". The third also desiderates a "World Directorate". All this is very like what B. Russell says.

It would be very interesting and useful to compare at length, in detail, the ideas of a book by such an outstanding modern thinker and writer on politics and sociology as Wells or Russell, with the corresponding ideas of the old Indian politico-sociology, and show how the latter *fill up* the *gaps* in the former, complete them, and take them on to the metaphysically and psychologically ascertained and unshakably determined (two-fold, or, by sub-division four-fold, Ends,) Goal, Greatest Good, Summum Bonum, of Human Life. But that would need a whole large volume for itself. The same is the case with the writings of the western psycho-analysts, philosophers, psychologists. This writer has endeavoured to indicate, very sketchily, the lines and results of such comparison, from time to time, in his other books; also all through this present book; but cannot and must not do it at any length here. The next chapter will list out the fundamental ideas, of the old thought, concerned with our present subject of World Order.

As regards Mr. Wells' views, it would be enough to say this much more here, that his conclusion, as indicated in the extract made above from his *Outline of History*, that the Hope of Humanity rests in and on a World State infused with, inspired and pervaded by, a World Religion, is in entire accord with the old Indian thought—so far as the words 'World State'

and 'World Religion' go. What the full and exact connotation of these names should be—on this, the old thought does *not go against* any modern thought which is not extremist, which does not emphasise and cling to a minute particular feature excessively; it only *completes* all such thought, by smoothing down the sharp angularities of each, synthesising and accommodating all, in their respectively appropriate times-places-circumstances. 'It takes all kinds to make a world'.

On the question immediately in hand, of Central Authority, the needed synthesis and reconciliation are effected by the old thought, through the same expedient which cures the troubles of the *two-Party* system of a Government and an Opposition. We should have a system of *four-Parties included* in one 'Party'; the military (as a sub-division of the executive) profession being kept apart from, though interdependent with, the learned (educational or other sub-divisional) profession, and the commercial and the industrial professions; and all four being 'guided', 'advised', 'directed', by a much improved, perfected, Spirituo-Material, Religio-Political form of the League of Nations, viz., a supreme central World Legislature, World Control, World Directorate, World Presidium, or what name you please. The four World Guilds would be the Eyes, the Hands, the Trunk, the Legs, of this Head or Brain; the Hands would be the Guild of the Executive Professions, including Military, Police, Civic Guards, Volunteers, Territorial Militia, Vigilantes, etc.; the Generalissimo, King, President, Imperator, or however he may be named, would be the Chief Executive and Chief *Servant* (not Master) of this Central World Legislature; as, in instinctively right theory only, he is, of the Legislatures or Councils, even in all modern States, and was, of the Senate, in Rome, from which, most western modern States have been drawing their laws and their politics. In the quotation made above from p. 42 of Wells' book, the words, *method of decision* and *administrative machinery*, have been italicised. If the functions signified by the two phrases are combined in one person or group, we have vast mischief. If we separate Legislative and Executive, we have the solution Mr. Wells is seeking, and 'none would be for Party, and all would be for State'.

In the quotation last made from his article, 'Unite—or Perish', (five years later than his book, *What are we to do with our Lives?*, and three years than the last revised edition of his *Outline of History*), he seems to have rather retrogressed in thought. But the reconciliation is easy, if only we define the

meanings of words precisely. Words, loosely used, are prolific parents of mischief, 'are, indeed, the very devil'; for the 'd-evil in man' enters into them and perverts them from their right original meaning into an entirely opposite and very wrong meaning. We have examined the cases of words like common-wealth, communism, autocracy, autonomy, self-government, loyalty, etc., before. In that quotation, Mr. Wells records his righteous revolt against an "over-riding government", against "rule" by it, against dictatorial, self-willed, vicious "masters." But interpret 'masters' as, not *masters of servants*, but as school-masters of school-boys, as '*cher maitre*', (see Mr. Wells' own use of the expression, p. 79, *supra*), as 'masters of science', as 'wise scientific and spiritual preceptors, legislators, counsellors, deciding authorities in matters of *opinion*—(and a legislature is, in correct theory, nothing else than this, sifting out and focussing in itself, the best, wisest, most scientific, most rational, and, in the circumstances, for the General Welfare, most useful and helpful Public *Opinion*)—and, surely, Mr. Wells will agree whole-heartedly to be *ruled* by the '*rulings*' of *such* Masters. The Guilds would be the willing and even glad servants of *such* Masters.

We will now close our commentary on Mr. Wells' valuable article, 'Unite—or Perish', with this last quotation from it.

"In summary, the backbone of my hope for a New World is this possibility of a world-wide *Coalescence* of all the scattered forces of creation and protest, into *One Consciously Revolutionary Movement, based on the Declared Rights of Man*. All over the democracies of the world now, we can call into being this uniform Opposition, inspired by a *Common Ideal of World Unity*...These two essential, tried and tested, democratic institutions, of *Opposition*, and a *Declaration of the Rights of Man*, dovetail into the *Plan of Creative Political Action* I am putting before you, and you see how *hard* it will be to *stop* this Contagious *Creative Liberalism* once it is *started*. This and *this alone*, so far as I can see, is the *Way of Escape* for our species from *Chaos*. Call it World Reconstruction, World Pacification, World Union, (World Federation), or World Revolution, as you will, but do not rashly refuse participation in these living possibilities, upon some minor issue. *And this is the Declaration of Rights:—*

THE DECLARATION OF RIGHTS.

(Originally drafted by Mr. H.G. Wells in 1939 ; revised by

ex-Lord Chancellor Lord Sankey's Committee; and published in *The Picture Post* of London, in May, 1940).

1. RIGHT TO LIVE.—Every man is a joint inheritor of all the natural resources, and of the powers, inventions and possibilities, accumulated by our forerunners. He is entitled, within the measure of these resources and without distinction of race, colour, or professed beliefs or opinions, to the nourishments, covering, and medical care, needed to realise his full possibilities of physical and mental development from birth to death. All men are to be deemed absolutely equal in the eyes of the law, and equally entitled to the respect of their fellow-men.

2. PROTECTION OF MINORS.—The natural and rightful guardians, of those who are not of an age to protect themselves, are their parents. In default of such parental protection, in whole or in part, the community, having due regard to the family traditions of the child, shall accept or provide alternative guardians.

3. DUTY TO THE COMMUNITY.—It is the duty of every man not only to respect but to uphold and to advance the rights of all other men throughout the world. Further more, it is his duty to contribute such service to the community as will ensure the performance of those necessary tasks, for which the incentives, which will operate in a free society, do not provide. It is only by doing his quota of service that a man can justify his partnership in the community. No man shall be conscripted for military or other service to which he has a conscientious objection; but to perform no social duty whatsoever is to remain unenfranchised and under guardianship.

4. RIGHT TO KNOWLEDGE.—It is the duty of the community to equip every man with sufficient education to enable him to be as useful and interested a citizen as his capacity allows. Furthermore, it is the duty of the community to render all knowledge available to him and such special education as will give him equality of opportunity for the development of his distinctive gifts in the service of mankind. He shall have easy and prompt access to all information necessary for him to form a judgment upon current events and issues.

5. FREEDOM OF THOUGHT AND WORSHIP.—Every man has a right to the utmost freedom of expression, discussion, association, and worship.

6. RIGHT TO WORK.—Subject to the needs of the

community, a man may engage in any lawful occupation, earning such pay as the contribution that his work makes to the welfare of the community may justify. He is entitled to paid employment and to make suggestions as to the kind of employment which he considers himself able to perform. Work for the sole object of profit-making shall not be a lawful occupation.

7. RIGHT IN PERSONAL PROPERTY.—In the enjoyment of his personal property, lawfully possessed, a man is entitled to protection from public or private violence, deprivation, compulsion and intimidation.

8. FREEDOM OR MOVEMENT.—A man may move freely about the world at his own expense. His private dwelling, however, and any reasonably limited enclosure of which he is occupant, may be entered only with his consent, or by a legally qualified person empowered with a warrant, as the law may direct. So long as by his movement he does not intrude upon the private domain of any other citizen, harm, or disfigure, or encumber, what is not his, interfere with, or endanger its proper use, or seriously impair the happiness of others, he shall have the right to come and go wherever he chooses, by land, air, or water, over any kind of country, mountain, moorland, river, lake, sea or ocean, and all the ample spaces of this, his world.

9. PERSONAL LIBERTY.—Unless a man is declared by a competent authority to be a danger to himself or to others through mental abnormality, a declaration which must be confirmed within seven days and thereafter reviewed at least annually, he shall not be restrained for more than twenty-four hours without being charged with a definite offence, nor imprisoned for more than three months without a trial. At a reasonable time before his trial, he shall be furnished with a copy of the evidence which it is proposed to use against him. At the end of the three months' period, if he has not been tried and sentenced by due process of the law, he shall be acquitted and released. No man shall be charged more than once with the same offence.

Although he is open to the free criticism of his fellows, a man shall have adequate protection from any misrepresentation that may distress or injure him. Secret evidence is not permissible. Statements recorded in administrative dossiers shall not be used to justify the slightest infringement of personal liberty. A dossier is merely a memorandum for adminis-

trative use; it shall not be used as evidence without proper confirmation in open court.

10. FREEDOM FROM VIOLENCE.—No man shall be subjected to any sort of mutilation except with his own deliberate consent, freely given, nor to forcible handling, except in restraint of his own violence, nor to torture, beating, or any other physical ill-treatment. He shall not be subjected to mental distress, or to imprisonment in infected, verminous, or otherwise insanitary quarters, or be put into the company of verminous or infectious people. But if he is himself infectious or a danger to the health of others, he may be cleansed, disinfected, put in quarantine, or otherwise restrained, so far as may be necessary to prevent harm to his fellows. No one shall be punished vicariously, by the selection, arrest, or ill-treatment of hostages.

11. Right of Law-making.—The rights embodied in this Declaration are fundamental and inalienable. In conventional and in administrative matters, but in no others, it is an obvious practical necessity for men to relinquish the free play of certain of these fundamental rights : (In, for example, such conventional matters as the rule of the road, or the protection of money from forgery, and in such administrative matters as town and country planning, or public hygiene.) But no law, conventional or administrative, shall be binding on any man, or on any section of the community, unless it has been made openly with the active or tacit acquiescence of every adult citizen concerned, given either by direct majority vote of the community affected, or by majority vote of his representatives publicly elected. These representatives shall be ultimately responsible for all bye-laws and for detailed interpretations made in the execution of the law.

In matters of co-operative and collective action, man must abide by the majority decisions, ascertained by electoral methods which give effective expression to individual choice. All legislation must be subject to public discussion, revision, or repeal. No treaties or contracts shall be made secretly in the name of the community. The fount of legislation is a free world is the whole people, and since life flows on constantly to new citizens, no generation can, in whole or in part, surrender or delegate this legislative power, inalienably inherent in mankind.

*Extract (revised) from Dr. Bhagavan Das' Letter
d/- 28 August, 1940, to the Editor, Picture Post.*

The 'Declaration of the *Rights of Man*' needs to be supplemented with a 'Declaration of the *Duties of Man*' and

also of Society. As it stands, only the third para of it is headed "Duty to the Community", and the fourth, 'Right to Knowledge', mentions two 'duties of the community'. The following '*Declaration of Duties*' is suggested, for addition.

1. Every Right is, or ought to be, necessarily bound to a corresponding Duty. The Right of one person is what is Due to him from another or others; and every such Right inevitably involves, or ought to involve, something which is simultaneously Due from him to that other or those others. 'Law' (from *legere*, to bind) is that which 'binds' a right and a duty together, in the first place; and then binds human beings, and even other living beings, together, in the bonds of appropriate rights-and-duties.

2. Every individual has a Duty to refrain from procreating more children than the Society, (Community, Nation, Country, State), to which he or she belongs, may declare that it is able to provide employment for, in view of the available resources of the country.

3. It is the Duty of every individual to refrain, on pain of forfeiture of equality in the eyes of the Law, from acts which may be declared to be anti-social, by the Legislature of the Society to which he belongs.

4. It is the Duty of the Society to constitute an adequate, competent, and efficient Educational Organisation or Guild of the Learned Professions, and, through it, to give to every person, adequate cultural as well as vocational education, in accord with his or her temperamental aptitude, to be carefully ascertained by the Educators.

5. It is the Duty of the Society to constitute an adequate, competent, and efficient Political Organisation or Guild of the Executive Professions, and, through it, to provide all the means necessary to ensure the protection of the people (1) from criminals, aggressors, invaders, (mainly by training the people in the arts of self-defence, through the Self-Defence Faculty of the Educational Organisation); (2) from diseases (through the Medical faculty of the Educational Organisation); (3) from injustice among the people (mainly by means of Arbitration Courts, guided, as necessary, by the Legal Faculty of the Educational Organisation), and (4) generally, from breach of peace, lawlessness, and disorder, by maintenance of adequate minimum Military and Police, and by the formation and support of Civic Guards and Vigilance Committees, composed of Citizen Volunteers.

A Department of it, in consultation with the other Organisations or Guilds, shall provide suitable employment for each individual of the Society who has completed education, in those cases in which any of the other three Organisations feels any difficulty in providing such employment itself. And it is the Duty of every such individual to pursue that occupation or employment properly, on pain of losing his livelihood. Any change of occupation, later on, which may be felt to be needed, should be arranged by the Department.

6. It is the Duty of the Society to constitute an Economic Organisation or Guild of the Commercial Professions, and, through it, to ensure the adequate production and distribution of all 'necessaries', of 'comforts', and of 'producible physical luxuries' as incentives, needed and deserved by individuals of different temperaments, who do their share of Duty in the Social Scheme properly.

7. It is the Duty of the Society, to constitute an Industrial Organisation or Guild of the Manual Workers or Labor Professions, and, through it, to ensure that all such unskilled or little skilled labor, as is needed by the other organisations for carrying on their work, is duly available to them.

8. It will be the Duty of the fourfold Guilds, of all the Societies of the world, to elect the best and wisest and most experienced of their members, to four corresponding Supreme World Guilds which will advise, co-ordinate, and control, to the minimum extent absolutely indispensable, the work of the corresponding Guilds of all countries.

9. It will be the Duty of each Society to elect, through its four Guilds, to a Legislature, or Authority, or Directorate, or Control (or however else it may be named), for itself, the best and wisest, the most selfless and the most experienced, persons of each of the four; and it will be the Duty of this Legislature to make good and wise laws, rules, decisions, or give or issue advice, counsel, instruction, direction, as may be indispensable, or be asked for by any Guild, for the good of the Society as a whole, from time to time.

10. It will be the Duty of these Legislatures of the several Societies (States, Nations, Countries, Communities) to elect their best and wisest to a Supreme World Legislature, whose Duty it will be to co-ordinate the work of all the Legislatures, as necessary, of all the Societies or countries.

“ When each Society, everywhere, is rationally organised

for peace, international relations will adjust themselves automatically and peacefully, and the work of the Supreme Central World Guilds and Legislature, and even of the 'national' ones, will be very small, much smaller than that of the present Governmental huge secretariats and vast offices and unwieldy Legislatures.

Election to the Legislature should not be by numerical ratios and 'arithmetical' devices and tricks (as for 'minorities' and 'majorities') which only make matters worse, always, or by territorial areas; it should be, what is now beginning to be recognised and called as, 'functional', 'vocational,' or 'occupational'. This is the 'ethico-psychological' principle, as contra-distinguished from the 'mechanical' and 'arithmetical' devices which alone occur, first and foremost, in an excessively 'mechanised', 'extravert', 'matter-minded' civilisation. It should also be kept in mind, that only the Four Main great Vocations and Functions of the Social Organism are to be recognised for purposes of elections; and no particular subdivision, of any of these, should be recognised as a separate function, for constituting a separate electorate. Otherwise, we shall have a welter of thousands of functions and electorates, like that of the 'hereditary castes' of India, which would make all rational work impossible. The four main functions correspond, psychologically, to (1) Cognition, (2) Action, (3) Desire, (4) all-supporting undifferentiated Vitality; and, physically, to (1) Head, (2) Arms, (3) Trunk, (4) Legs; broadly, generally. A Legislature, Central Authority or Directorate or Guild, with even a hundred, much more a few thousand, *separate, conflicting, trade-interests*, (as contra-distinguished from *inter-dependent functions*), represented on it, and constituting as many different 'parties' in it, would be an impossible nightmare, a perpetual scrimmage or *melée*, which would cause only vast evil, directly or indirectly, to society, and no good at all.¹

¹See p. 316, *supra*, ré Shri K. L. Munshi's criticism and exposure of Reforms Commissioner Mr. Hodson's attempts.

CHAPTER XIV.

or

APPENDIX C.

Traditional Indian Principles of Social Organisation.

The preceding chapters have attempted to build up, with material supplied largely by British, other European, and U.S. American, and partly by Indian, writers and speakers, the walls, so to say, of the House in which the future World State and World Religion should dwell. That material has been collected under the pressure of the persistent demand, "*Why, What for*, these ghastly Wars, on land, in air, on and in sea, in east and west, all over the earth; *Why, What for*, the vast unrest and turmoil in India; *What do we want by it all?*"¹. Even an uneducated village-man, when he

¹Mr. Arthur Moore, editor of the *Statesman*, Calcutta, recently returned to India, after a long stay in England and tours in U.S.A. and other countries, to study war-conditions first-hand, on the spot, wrote, in the issues d/- 12 and 18th Nov., 1941, in signed articles, sentences which should be reproduced here. This writer had decided not to use any material later than 31-10-1941, from the daily press, in this book; but these statements, of such a competent and impartial writer, well-wisher of Britain and India both, and so much in support of the plea of this book, cannot well be omitted.

"In both countries, Britain and America, there is overwhelming evidence of *deep dissatisfaction at the lack of clear statement of War aims or Peace aims*. The British of course are well aware that they are fighting to save themselves. But that is not enough. They want a positive ideal. They suspect that powerful interests want to save, not only the country, but the old system which leads to wars, (and)...contemplate nothing but a patched-up peace; believing that 'there must always be wars', and that a *World Order* is an impossible dream...By a 'good peace' they only mean a long interval

goes to the booking-clerk at a Railway Station, does not say merely, "Give me a ticket," he also says "for such a particular place"; he does not say merely "for travel, for victory, for freedom", as the Leaders of the Nations, super-

between two wars...The fact that the big public is not yet 'all out' in this war is well-known to the authorities, and causes the gravest concern". When this is the case in Britain, is it any wonder that 'India in Bondage' cannot put herself 'all out' for a war to maintain British Imperialism and Indian Bondage? "The British people have a strong feeling of solidarity with workers all over the world, and while aware of the necessity for bombing enemy cities, they do not share the satisfaction of the more prosperous classes, at the thought of workers' homes being shattered in other countries. While the British public feels the need of clearer War Aims, *in America the demand for a positive ideal is incomparably intensified*.. In neither country did the Atlantic Charter go with a swing. Disappointment was openly expressed....*Hitler offers World Peace, the end of all war in a single World Economy ruled by the German Reich. That is, from our point of view, the Peace of Death, but it is an intelligible aim. Nothing less than an Ideal for a World Peace which shall be the Peace of Life, and rest on consent, is fit to stand against it.*"

In the issue of 18-11-1941, Mr. A. Moore writes: "To me an unexpected thing was the unusual interest, I found both in Britain and America, in India...Never had I found such anxiety for news from India, such deep desire to understand what was happening, such bewilderment and heart-searching". Then he describes, in detail, the proofs he saw of this. He mentions particularly, the work of "the Argonauts", i.e., "the India Section of the Youth Movement", of Oxford and Cambridge, "which is backed by seventy M.P.'s, the Archbishop of York being on the Council".

Mr. H. N. Brailsford, another veteran journalist, who has travelled over more, seen more, knows more, of the countries of the earth, than most of the Cabinet Ministers, writing in *Reynolds' News* (London, 15-11-1941), under the caption 'Give India a Chance', says: "Poor men can always be found to serve in the ranks and the factories for pay; but the will power and the intelligence of these people are not enlisted in a truly national effort. India will not fight for us or for the King-Emperor. She will fight only for *her own freedom*. She will

educated, super-cléver, super-men are doing. Common-sense says, "Visualise your End, your Object, your Goal, clearly, first ; then think out and carry out the Means".

Under the drive of this cry, the walls have been put up, somehow ; preparation made ; public attention and thought endeavoured to be led in the wanted direction ; in this book, so far. But to complete the house, a roof is needed. The materials for the roof also have been partly collected in the preceding chapters, in the shape of *indications* of the Ancient Solutions of Modern Problems. What follows, is intended to be an endeavour to lay, to shape, to consolidate, the roof, by very briefly enunciating the main principles on which the traditional Indian Social Structure was founded. This writer has been more and more firmly and profoundly convinced, with the growth of his thought on these matters, during the last fifty years, that those *principles* are *fit for use* in *modern conditions also* ; and, if properly applied, can solve all the problems that are harrassing Mankind today. He has been supported and encouraged in this view by so very competent a judge of these matters as Mrs. Annie Besant ; (see her Introduction to his book, *The Science of Social Organisation*, first published in 1910). Those principles are stated in the following extract, slightly revised, from this writer's book, *The Essential Unity of All Religions*.

The Indian Scheme of Individuo-Social Organisation.

"Vaidika Dharma, (etymologically, 'Scientific Religion', 'Religion of Knowledge' ; now, in its degenerate form and practice, known as Hinduism), has one feature, the so-called 'Caste-system', which is supposed to be peculiar to it, and not to be found in any other religions scheme. The supposition is not quite correct ; nor wholly incorrect. In every Society,

do it with her might as and when she has a National Government of her own to lead her ." Mr. Brailsford then very rightly suggests that if Mr. Churchill would "for half an hour . suppose that he had come into the world endowed with talents, courage, and *brown skin*, he would rally Indians easily. ...The prisons must be flung open and the seven provinces have Indian Ministries once more...The formal Constitution can wait till after the war, but *we must undertake now* that India's National Government shall shape it". (See pp. 22-4, *supra*).

Compare this last suggestion with that made in this book, at pp. 16 and 247-8.

the outlines of such a system are more or less discernible; because they inhere in human psycho-physical individuo-social nature. These outlines are drawn firmly, and filled in fully and deliberately, in Vaidika Dharma, That Dharma, 'Religion of character-istic rights-and-duties', enjoins a Social Structure, dealing with all aspects of human life, comprehensively and systematically.

"The one craving of Humanity is for Bread; (a) Bread Spiritual, and (b) Bread Material. The one problem of problems is, How provide an adequate and equitable supply of the two, to each and all? Socialism and Communism, Fascism and Nazism, seemingly antagonistic, are yet, all of them, only attempts to solve this problem; more or less unsuccessful, because of non-perception, non-recognition, of fundamental psycho-physical laws and facts of Human Nature. All religions seek, sub-consciously when not consciously, to minister to both needs. De-generations set in, in their practice, because of the growth of excessive selfishness in the custodians. God's Nature never stands still; is always swinging to and fro Between opposite Extremes. Everything that is born and grows, must also decay and pass away. Re-generations, new births, must also follow, in new forms, new em-bodi-ments. The soul, the idea, the ideal, the principle, remains the same. The present phase, in the Life of the Human Race, requires 'a democratist and socialist Religion', which will include 'a democratist and socialist Polity', i.e., a complete Individuo-Social Organisation of the whole Human Race.

"It is not enough to *pray*, however sincerely and ardently, that God's Will be done on earth. It is also necessary to *know* what that Will is, in order to subserve it, to act in obedience to it, with open eyes. It is not enough to be *willing* to do one's Duty, one's Dharma, without greed for reward. We must also *know* clearly what that Duty is, if we are to discharge it actively and efficiently. It is not enough to be *ready*, even *eager*, to obey the Golden Rule, 'Do to others as you wish that they should do unto you.' We must also *know* what, in any given situation, we *ought to wish*, for self and therefore for others; if we are to act according to that Rule, usefully, rightly, and not mistakenly, mischievously, creating confusion all round. It is not enough to be non-violent, negatively, not committing violence; not enough to be truthful, negatively, not telling lies; we must also *know* what good deeds to do non-violently, positively; *know* what truths to

tell, positively. It is not enough to *desire* Swaraj, Freedom, World Peace. We must also *know* what exactly they mean, what they consist in, specifically, and how they can be achieved and maintained.

"Spirituo-Material Science, as taught in the great utterances and writings of highly evolved members of the Human Race, supermen endowed with extra-ordinary powers of observation, sensation, intellection, intuition, tireless application and research—such Science gives us the needed knowledge. It tells us, (I-a), in broad outlines, What God's Will, i.e., Nature's Plan and Law, is, on the infinite-and-infinitesimal scale, what the Nature of the World-Process and the Meaning and Purpose of Life are; (I-b) What man's General Duty is; and (II) How Human Society should be organised and individual Life planned, with clear specification and partition of all particular rights and corresponding duties; so that each one of us may be able to ascertain readily what his proper vocation, and his vocational and personal duties and corresponding rights, are, in various situations; and may have both his needs, spiritual and material, cultural and occupational, duly satisfied, in accordance with that Will, Law, Nature, Purpose, Meaning.

"The normal human being is not a solitary. He is born in a family of at least two parents, which lives amidst a community of families. He lives, grows, decays, dies, in a family, amidst a community. His joys and sorrows are unavoidably and inseparably bound up with those of others. It is impossible for any individual to carry out the Divine Will, observe the Golden Rule, perform his Duty, and achieve any reasonable amount of Happiness here and hereafter, (i.e., secure Material and Spiritual Bread); (i) *if* the community, the society, amidst which he is born, lives, and dies, is not systematically *organised for peace* and prosperity, (which includes, as a subsidiary, organisation for *defence*); and (ii) *if* the life of the individual is not correctly mapped out and planned, and fitted into that social organisation, in such a way, that each person, in accord with his special temperament and vocational aptitude, (a) receives appropriate education, (b) readily secures, or is provided with, a suitable occupation for his and family's livelihood, with due regard to that aptitude as ascertained and developed by his educators, (c) retires from bread-winning work in right time, to take up some one or more out of numerous kinds of honorary unremunerated

public duties, in keeping with his special capacities, and, finally, (d) spends the last years of his physical life in ever greater absorption in spiritual exercises, meditations, well-wishing to the world at large, and promoting the general welfare by pouring into the moral psychical atmosphere, a continuous stream of benevolence, 'good-will', and the powerful influence of high example of life well-lived in the past, and now incarnating God's blessings of renunciant selflessness, contented repose of soul, and all resignedness and spiritual peace.

The Védic Scheme of Individuo-Social Organisation.

(I-a) The Infinite Spirit descends into denser and denser finite forms of matter, and then re-ascends back out of them, on all possible scales of Time, Space, and Motion, from minutest atom and microscopic animalcule to vastest star-system; and (I-b) at the stage of the human form, on the return journey, 'We should do unto others as we would be done by'.¹

¹On pp. 113-114 of *What are we to do with our Lives?*, Mr. Wells enumerates "seven broad principles as defining the Open Conspiracy and holding it together". The sixth and seventh are, "(6) The supreme duty of subordinating the personal career to the creation of a World Directorate capable of these tasks, and to the general advancement of human knowledge, capacity, and power; (7) The admission therewith that our *immortality* is conditional and lies in the *race* and not in the individual selves". But Mr. Wells thoughtfully and wisely adds that "of these, one, the seventh, may be...unnecessary". Compare with Mr. Wells' principles, the Three Objects of the Theosophical Society, (see p 71, *supra*), placed before Mankind in 1875, which have, since then, been broadcast in every country, but, most unfortunately, have not been able to go home to the hearts of the *leaders* of the nations. The tremendous hammer-strokes of this awful War may drive them home, and complete the work which the previous Great War began. These Three Objects contain all, and far more than, Mr. Wells' principles do. By extreme reaction against the outrageous and also egregious ego-ism or ego-tism and ambition for "personal career", which have brought about such Wars, and cause all Human Misery; reaction coupled with recognition of the facts of Continuity in Nature, of Indestructibility of Matter-Energy, of Conservation running

(II) Vaidika Dharma prescribes a Scheme of Individual Social Organisation, applicable to the whole Human Race. This Scheme makes an equitable partition, between the several human 'types', according to temperament, of different kinds of 'work-and-wages', 'labour-and-leisure', 'hardship-and-pleasure', 'rights-and-duties', 'incentives-and-excellences'; makes it possible to ensure 'necessaries' for everyone; gives opportunity to each person to win additional, temperamentally suitable and desired, 'comforts' and also psycho-physical 'luxuries', by special good work; provides appropriate incentives to good work in the shape of such luxuries; secures regulated and just play for all human instincts, egoistic as well as altruistic; reconciles individualism and socialism, imperialist capitalism and communist proletarianism, by vigilantly guarding against the one Sin, 'Excess', through the sedulous cultivation and practice of the one Virtue, 'the Golden Mean'; and, by doing all this, it enables every one to know precisely what his particular duty, and corresponding right, is, in any particular situation; and gives, to every one, just opportunity as well as instruction for securing happiness, here and hereafter, as far as is humanly possible.

The details of this Scheme have been dealt with else-

through perpetual Transformation, of Mind or Spirit above and beyond and controlling Matter; and with non-recognition, as yet, fully and widely, of the other truths taught by the Upanishats; there has grown up a strong tendency in the west, latterly, among thoughtful minds—renowned seniors like (the late) Havelock Ellis, G. B. Shaw, H. G. Wells, B. Russell, (the late) Alfred Adler, and juniors of note like Aldous Huxley and many others—to deprecate belief in 'personal' immortality, and to assert, belaud, recommend belief in, only 'impersonal' immortality. The Vedanta provides for both; the 'personal' selves take on the 'reflection' of the Impersonal, All-personal, and *Eternal* Self, with which they are identical in essence. The reader who has noted the analysis, in the preceding pages, of the nature of the 'uniquenesses' of 'individuality' and 'universality', will have seen how Vedanta can reconcile both. *The Science of Peace* attempts to expound it more fully. But we may heartily concur, here, in Mr. Wells' declaration, that such belief as is indicated in para (I-a) above, is "un-necessary" for our present purpose; though it makes things easier to understand.

where.¹ The main principles may be summed up in a few tetrads.

It must be borne in mind, always, that there is nothing exhaustive or exclusive about the lists given or distinctions drawn in any of the quartettes mentioned here; but only an indication of the *predominant* feature or quality. Patently, all organs and all functions are inter-dependently present in every living human Mind-Body; equally clearly, some are more strong and prominent in one, others in another; wherefore we call one person a professor, another a captain, another a banker, and a fourth a shepherd or mill hand; though all are men.

There are:

1. Four main types of human beings, by temperament and vocational aptitude; *not* by mere 'heredity', *but* by individual 'mutation' or 'spontaneous variation': (a) men (and women) of Knowledge; (b) of Action; (c) of acquisitive Desire; (d) of undeveloped undifferentiated mentality and capacity, of general Labor, of unspecialised work.

2. Four main classes of vocations, occupations, professions, with numerous sub-divisions under each: (a) the Learned; (b) the Executive; (c) the Commercial; (d) the Industrial or laboring.²

¹In the present writer's *Ancient vs. Modern Scientific Socialism*; more briefly, in *The Science of the Self*, ch. vii; in greater detail, in *The Science of Social Organisation*, Vols. I and II, a third being in preparation.

²Compare the British 'Clergy, Nobility, Commons, Laborites', in the two Houses of Parliament; the Russian Soviet's '(Intellectual) Workers, Soldiers, Peasants, (Manual) Workers'; the German 'Lehrstand, Wehrstand, Nahrstand, Verkerstand', (some writers reverse the order of the last two); the 'Churchmen, Knights, Burghers-Yeomanry, Villeins-Serfs,' of the Middle Ages. Also, the medicine-men, witch-doctors, wise men, priests; fighters, warriors, chiefs, kings; cultivators of the soil, traders, pedlars; hewers of wood, drawers of water, slaves, 'maids-of-all-work', of earlier ages. In this connection, the Samskr̥t-knowing should ponder these words of the Gītā: Chātūr-varṇyam Mayā sṛṣtam, guṇa-karma-vibhāga-shah; Karmāṇi pra-vi-bhaktāni swa-bhāva-pra-bhavair-guṇaih. Arabic-and-Persian-knowing friends may consider the following words of Abul Fazl's *Āin-i-Akbarī*: Jahaniān az chahār garoh burūn

3. Four main kinds of livelihood : (a) Honoraria, fees, presents ; (b) taxes, tributes, public Salaries ; (c) Profits ; (d) Wages.

4. Four main stages of the individual life : (a) Student ; (b) Householder ; (c) honorary Unremunerated Public Worker, retired from competitive bread-winning ; (d) Renunciant Asectic, hermit, anchoret, recluse.

5. Four main physical appetites, urges : (a) Hunger ; (b) Aquisitiveness ; (c) Sex ; (d) rest and Recreation, health and Play, general sense of physical well-being.

There are subordinate quartettes under each of these four.

(5-a) Four kinds of Food : (1) bloodless, light, easily-digested, but sustaining, non-volatile, bland, mostly light cereal and root-fruit-and-milk diets, for the spiritual scientist, who needs lucid mind and long calm steady thinking ; (2) strong, stimulating, energy-producing foods, for the administrator, the executive officer, who has to decide and act quickly and meet emergencies ; for the warrior, even flesh-foods and alcoholic drinks, in moderation, are allowed ; preferably the flesh of wild animals that damage crops and multiply too much ; not of animals specially reared for slaughter and eating ; (3) 'staying' heavier cereals, milk-foods, also the flesh of crop-destroying animals, for the tradesman and the agriculturist ; (4) heavy foods, (nitrogenous), producing capacity for long-continued plodding bodily exertion, for the workman and laborer.

(5-b) Four kinds of special Possessions, suited for the four temperaments, and needed for the efficient carrying on of their professions, respectively, e.g., (1) libraries, laboratories, objects and means of observation, facilities for travel and investigation ; (2) weapons, munitions, office apparatus, and subsidiaries ; (3) machinery and other means and requisites of production and distribution ; (4) implements of work.

(5-c) Four kinds of Marriages : (1) settled by wise elders ; (2) by mutual self-choice, or by love-chase, and 'capture' ; (3) for monetary consideration ; (4) by blind passion.¹

na bāshand ; (1) ahl-i-qalam, (2) mabārizan, (3) pēsha-warān wa bāzar-gūnān, (4) kishāwarzān wa barza-garān. To Zoroastrian leaders, we would recommend for consideration, the words of their scriptures ; (1) horistāran, (2) nūristāran, (3) rozistāran, (4) soristāran.

¹All the kinds of Marriages and Sex-unions described in Westermarck's large three-volume work, and in more recent

(5-d) Four kinds of Recreation : (1) communion with Nature, contemplation of her beauties ; (2) sports of various kinds, involving quickness of mind as well as body, hunting,

books on Free Love, Companionate Marriage, Trial Marriage ; all sorts of monogamy, polygamy, endogamy, exogamy, polygyny, polyandry, group-marriage, promiscuity, adultery, prostitution, etc., dealt with in the now immense and still growing modern literature on Sex ; will probably be found classifiable under these four forms. After a riot and revel of public sex-laxity, in these first three or four decades of the twentieth century after Christ, especially after the previous Great War ; because of reaction against the excessive prudery, puritanism, private immorality, and hypocrisy, of previous decades ; 'modern man', even in Communist Soviet Russia, is returning again to belief in some sort of monogamy, as best ; 'monogamy' being understood as permanent union between one man and one woman, whether 'sanctified by religious ritual', or 'legalised by a registrar's civic ceremonial', or 'moralised by a mutual gentleman's-and-lady's understanding', but, in every case, known publicly. Havelock Ellis' essay on 'The Function of Taboos', (*More Essays of Love and Virtue*, 1931), is a very useful little piece of work, and sums up the experience of his (then) seventy years of life, and the result of his lifelong studies. He says, very rightly, that if "discipline imposed from *without*" has become intolerable, then it must be replaced by discipline from *within* ; for "life is always a discipline", is impossible without discipline. "The disappearance of the old discipline of *external taboos*, imposes on us, inescapably, the creation of a new self-discipline of *internal and personal taboos*"; and "sex is a sphere in which change has of late taken place with unusual rapidity ; but, because sex is at once an extremely important region", (the very source of new life, which will be good or bad according as the sex-moods, sex-relations, sex-unions are good or bad), "so that it becomes a training ground for the social activities generally, and yet a region in which most of the essentials do not lend themselves to direct external control, therefore its *taboos* must be both made and maintained... privately". The new western literature on the subject will, bye and bye, write the justifying commentary on the old Indian teachings, on Brahma-charya on the one hand, and Kāma-charya on the other, i.e., on 'student-life' and 'householder-life', respectively.

— racing, fencing, animal taming and training; (3) trials of luck with small money-stakes, supervision of charitable works, home-athletics; (4) gymnastics, fairs, shows, simple games. The pleasure of 'pilgrimage' is appreciated by, and is open to, all types; and pilgrimages may be and are performed during any of the four stages of life; but they are recommended for the last two. To the practical worldly benefits of pilgrimage, may be added the liberalising education and aesthetic enjoyment that are derived from wide travel, and the seeing of other towns, cities, peoples, ways and manners, monuments of human art, and Nature's grand and ever-varied scenery, woods, waters, mountains, deserts, snows, and seas, which make her Poetry of the Sublime, the Awful, the Beautiful, ever and everywhere the Wonderful.

6. Four main psychical appetites, incentives, 'luxuries', cravings, for: (a) Honor (public esteem); (b) Power (official authority); (c) Wealth (artistic possessions); (d) Enjoyment (of one-self; compare the common phrase, 'we enjoyed ourselves thoroughly').¹

¹Many friends, who are generally in sympathy with the ideas embodied in the quartettes enunciated here, still feel great difficulty as to how they can be carried into *practice* in modern conditions; especially as regards the partition of the tetrad of Honor-Power-Wealth-Play; and still more particularly as regards Honor. 'Will a small-salaried village Schoolmaster receive greater Honor than a higher-salaried general of Army or Manager of a large Business-concern or Bank?' The reply is, 'Among a People who have thoroughly imbibed the Principles, by Right Education, who have become Right-minded, (as so many are now Mammon-minded and War-minded because of Wrong Education), such psycho-social matters will be adjusted *auto-matically*'. In a 'well-bred' company, such a 'schoolmaster' or 'priest', or 'scientist', if senior in years, truly ascetic and philanthropic, and full of learning, will surely receive more marks of honor, salutation, deferential speech, courtesies, than persons of the other professions. In a large and well-bred joint family, the question, who shall receive more and who less love from whom, does not arise. It arises only when the 'good breeding' begins to fail, and characters begin to spoil, and causes for irritation, jealousy, avarice, etc., arise. Also, if absolutely necessary, 'codes' and 'conventions' can be created; as 'the warrants

7. Four main 'ends' of life : (I) Sense-en-Joy-ment, subdivided into, (a) (observance of) Lawfulness-and-Morality, (which regulate) (b) Wealth, Riches, (which refine) (c) (psycho-physical) Pleasure ; and (II), Soul-en-Joy-ment, or, (d) (Spiritual) Happiness, (en-Joy-ment of the Great Self).

8. Four main social institutions : (a) Religion-Law ; (b) Property ; (c) Family ; (d) all-helping Government-Church-State¹.

of precedence' etc., and 'forms' and 'formulas', for 'court-functions', in medieval and modern States, (not only in mon-archical but even in republican, though less elaborate); consider the words and phrases, 'court-esy', 'court-ly manners', 'court-etiquette', 'court-ier', 'court-ship,' etc. But—the need for such 'discipline from *without*', means 'the decay of discipline from *within*', which latter is the only real genuine discipline; and *psychical things* like *honor* or *love* are not easy to measure out precisely. There is no greater difficulty in practising these principles than any others now current ; indeed, there is much less ; what are needed are, the *conviction* that they are *right*, and the *will* to do the *right*. That other views are much more difficult to work smoothly, are far more 'un-practical', is proved by the current War and the whole condition of the modern world, as indicated in the very first para of this book.

¹These four institutions of Society will persist always, in essence, so long as human psycho-physique continues to be at all like what it is at present ; though the forms and formulas and names may, and will, change from time to time ; witness Russia, which, after vast endeavours to destroy them, after 1917, had to revert to them gradually, within three decades. Indeed, the rudiments of them may be seen even among animals. They are nothing else than developements, consequences, regulations, of the primal instincts of self-expansion, self-multiplication, and self-enjoyment. These instincts are at the root and source of individualised life ; are inherent in, and inseparable from, the feel of separate existence, existence as a 'separate individual', amidst other 'separate individuals'. The subject has been dealt with in detail in *The Science of the Emotions* and *The Science of the Self*. The young mind, ambitious to be 'original', something entirely 'unique' and 'distinguished' and separate from and superior to all others, thinks it can, and attempts to, create a 'Revolution' in Life, to invent something that was never heard of or seen before.

9. Four main 'powers' of the State : (a) Science power ; (b) Valour (Military) power ; (c) Finance (Bread-and-Money) power ; (d) Labour power.

10. Four main sets of Rights-and-Duties, for the four main temperaments and professions : (a) duty to gather and to spread true and useful knowledge of all sorts ; right to receive special honor from the other three classes ; (b) duty to develop the needed ability, and give protection to all who need and deserve it, and to maintain law and order and peace in the land ; right to be entrusted with official authority and power of command over the people generally, in accord with the law ; (c) duty to arrange for the production and distribution of all necessities and comforts, in accord with the laws of the State ; right to receive price (which will yield reasonable profits, and bring special artistic possessions, within the limits permitted by the law) ; (d) duty to give help and service

This is not only natural, but also desirable, for the young mind, *within limits*, to vary the mono-tony of life with multi-tony. But, after the vaulting and restless fresh 'genius' craving for change, 'mutation', 'spontaneous variation', has 'revolved' the 'wheel of life' with self-assertive assiduity and energy for some time ; he finds that the top, which he had successfully and pridefully sent to the bottom, is resistlessly coming up to its old position again ; and the bottom, which he had exultingly brought to the top, is equally uncheckably going down to its old place. In childhood and youth, because our eyes are new, we see all things as new, see new heavens and new earths. In old age, when our eyes have grown old, we see that every thing is very old, very recurrent, repetitive, cyclical ; that there is really "nothing new under the sun", though every sun-rise and every sun-set is more or less different from every other. This difference is very desirable ; lest we suffer surfeit and *ennui*. But again *within limits* ; for the human being, accustomed to and enjoying the variations of the dawns and eves of the temperate zone, eleven to thirteen hours apart, dies, if suddenly transported to the very different polar mornings and evenings, six months apart. So, let the energetic young mind turn the wheel, but not too fast ; and, also, let young and old together, in mutual consultation, accommodation, equi-tisation, agreement, put the wheel, not in a vertical position, but a horizontal ; so that there may be no top and bottom, but only side and side, side by side.

to the others ; right to receive adequate wages and be provided with amusements, (*panem et circenses*). Besides the special rights and duties above mentioned, the general Right belongs to all, to receive necessities of life, and suitable means, in accord with their capacities, of discharging their duties properly, (see 5-b above) ; and also the Right to be provided with their respective appropriate work and livelihoods, and none other ; (see 2 and 3 above) ; and the general Duty to perform properly their several functions, as parts of the Social Whole.

11. Four main Duties of the older generation towards the younger, and of the State towards the People, viz., to : (a) Educate, (b) Protect, (c) Nourish and cherish, (d) Help in all other ways as needed. Briefly, to (a) Teach, (b) Guard, (c) Feed, (d) Serve. The constituent or preventive functions of the State are covered by (b) ; the ministrant or promotive, by (a, c, d).

12. Four main interlinked Subordinate Organisations, which together make up the total Individuo-Social Organisation of the State or People as a whole : (a) Educational ; (b) Protectional, (political, administrative, executive, military) ; (c) Economic ; (d) Industrial. Only such a 'totally' complete Organisation of the 'total' People makes the true 'totalitarian' State.

The (a) Educational organisation is made up of the learned classes or professions, and the student order or 'stage', i.e., of educator and educand in the broad sense ; the (b) Protectional, of the executive professions, and the order of honorary publicists to guide and supervise them ; the (c) Economic, of the commercial professions as producers and distributors, and of the order of householders as consumers ; the (d) Industrial, of the workman class, the laboring professions, the little-skilled or unskilled manual workers, of many grades, as the *physical* helpers of the community, and the order of renunciant ascetics as the *spiritual* servants.

13. Four main congenital Social 'Debts', laden with which, every human being is born : (a) to the 'gods' i. e., the forces of Nature, which spread out the universe of objects on which our life and senses feed, and all our pleasurable and painful experience is based ; (b) to the 'ancestors', who have given to us our body, with its sensor and motor organs, in and through which our life is lived and the world of objects is contacted ; (c) to the 'sages, seers, scientists' of the past, who have left to us the stores of knowledge which differen-

tiate us from the lower kingdoms and refine and ennoble our life ; (d) to the Supreme Self, which has given us the spark of life, mind, consciousness, our soul, on which all else depends.

14. Four main ways of 'Repayment' of those 'Debts', and of winning final Release, Spiritual Freedom, Moksha, *Najāt*, Beatitude, Bliss of Salvation ; (a) performing 'pious works', (such as plantation of trees, re-forestation of denuded tracts ; construction of various water-works, wells, tanks, reservoirs, lakes, canals ; protection and promotion of useful and beautiful animal life ; purifying of the mental and physical atmosphere ; by chanting holy hymns, reading and reciting the emotion-purifying, soul-elevating, mind-expanding, heart-ennobling scriptures and noble epics and books ; by burning incense, lighting sacred fires and lights with special substances ; whereby the stores of Nature, 'ether', air, fire, water, earth, which we use up or pollute, and also our depleted and struggle-and-passion-soiled mental powers, are replenished and sanitated ; in modern conditions, building colleges, hospitals, parks, carrying out measures for abating 'smoke-nuisance' and 'noise-nuisance', preventing contamination of water and growth of disease-germs, converting sewage into manure and all the other 'public works', which represent what, in the earlier times, were called 'pious works' ; (b) rearing worthy progeny, *neither too many, nor too few*, (to preserve *balance* between produce and consumers), of the *best quality* possible ; (c) giving knowledge, or helping the learned class to give it, to the new generation ; also adding to the existing stores of knowledge, or enabling others to do so ; (d) retirement from competition, renunciation, spiritual meditation, realisation of the identity of the Individual with the Universal, and earnestly and constantly wishing well to all.

In the first two quarters or stages of each person's life, the Individualist or Egoistic Instincts are given regulated and growingly restricted play ; in the last two, the Socialist or Altruistic Instincts are gradually brought to culmination. In this way are all 'isms' duly balanced and reconciled ; the State exists for the Individual and the Individual lives for the State ; Each is for All, All are for Each ; to Each is given according to his Need, from Each is taken according to his Capacity.

We have noted before that all the factors of all these tetrads are inter-dependent, like the head, arms, trunk, and legs ; or like the nervous, muscular, glandulo-vascular, and skeletal systems ; of a single living human organism ; also,

that only the main factors, groups, classes, can be broadly distinguished, while the sub-divisions intermingle, pass into, permeate and pervade each other, so subtly and inextricably, that attempt at any too precise demarcation is bound to fail. As said in the *Gītā* : 'de-fini-tion is a passing from the In-defi-nite to the In-defi-nite'. "From the Great Deep to the Great Deep he goes". The arrangement by tetrads is also a matter of convenience only. The facts and factors may be, and elsewhere have been, grouped in duads and trinities as well as quintettes. The variety in the presentation of the ideas should, to the scrutinising mind, bring out the basic truths, only the more clearly. Also, in detailed working, subordinate tetrads may be distinguished and formulated usefully, under each of the others, as under (5), above ; e.g., four pathological constitutions ; four corresponding methods of treatment ; four types of crimes and criminals ; four corresponding kinds of punishment ; and so on.

Such is a brief sketch of the ancient Vedic Individuo-Social Organisation. It is an Essential part of Védism, one of the names of which is Varṇ-āshrama Dharma, 'the Duty of Social Vocational Classes and Individual Life-Stages'.

The Principles, above listed, constitute the fundamentals for any and every complete Charter of Humanity and Organisation of the Human Race for Peace ; every real, sincere, World Charter, (in contra-distinction from 'diplomatic, cunningly-worded, Atlantic Charters'). These Principles explain why the suggestion for an additional Declaration of Duties, has been made in the form in which it has been made, at the end of the preceding chapter. All particular details, as to how particular nations or races or groups should feel and behave, one to another, arise out of these fundamentals automatically ; it being always remembered that the *name* Hindu, or Muslim, Christian, etc., or Briton, or Frenchman, German, Russian, Indian, Chinese, Japanese, American, Italian, etc., is not branded on the forehead of any human being, by Nature ; while 'human being' *is* stamped on the face every human being.

CHAPTER XV.

or

APPENDIX D.

"MAKE PEACE ; DESIRE FRIENDSHIP ;
NOT VICTORY".

Some Miscellaneous Extracts and Notes.

IMPORTANT LETTERS FROM MAHATMA GANDHI.

The seventh chapter of this book is headed as the first line of the above caption. "A Prayer to the Warring Nations", d/- 31-5-1941, (three weeks before the invasion of Russia by Germany), to the same effect, was sent by this writer to a number of dailies of India ; and at least one, The *National Herald* (Lucknow), published it. Separately printed copies of the "Prayer" were posted to the Viceroy, the provincial Governors, and other high officials of India, to the Prime Minister and other Cabinet Ministers of Britain, and to the Editors of several journals of Britain and U.S.A. The rulers and journals of other belligerent countries were out of reach ; but if any dailies of Britain or U.S.A. published it, (this writer does not know if any did), then, possibly, it may have been noticed in other countries too. It is reproduced below, in abridged and revised form.

A Prayer to the Warring Nations.

Britain and Germany ! both of you stand on the very topmost rung of modern civilisation. Both have the greatest achievements of western Philosophy, Literature, Science, Art, to your credit. You are very near each other, biologically, intellectually, politically, territorially. You are cousins ; offspring of the same ancient Indo-Aryan, Indo-European, Stock. *Make Peace ; Desire Friendship ; Not Victory.*

Be Wise ; not only Brave. Even the animals, lions and tigers, are brave. You are human ; you should be more than

they. Be Merciful—to Mankind, and also to yourselves. *Why* will you go on slaughtering each other? *What for?* Examine your *Motives*; *sincerely*. Realise that none of you is on the Right Path. Then you will turn, all of you, to the Right Path. The Horrors that have been inflicted by each upon the other—count them as Expiation of manifold national Sins, committed by all of you in the past. So only can you assuage, by the balm of tranquillity, the agonies of your burning hearts. Let bygones be bygones. Forget the past. Otherwise, this Hideous Vendetta of the nations will burn up all in the conflagration you have raised.

Why will you persist in this Fratricidal, homicidal, War? Let not the Sun of European Civilisation go down upon your anger. Let it not be drowned in the sea of blood you are making. Throw off, both of you, your Imperialist Madness, your Craving to *Dominate* the world. Shut the doors of memory, resolutely, upon the old unhappy far-off things and battles of the past. REPENT. Cry aloud: "We have sinned, *all* of us; we will not sin again". Let the dead past bury its dead. Clasp strong hands in fast friendship with each other. Co-operate, in Philanthropic spirit, to *Uplift* mankind; do not compete, to *Dominate* it. You two, in such Benevolent Emulation, can bring Heaven to Earth; instead of pouring Hell upon it, as you are doing now, to the Woe of all Mankind as well as yourselves. Mother Earth already produces enough, and can produce much more, for the feeding, clothing, sheltering, comforting, of all; if only you would employ the talents of your great Scientists wisely and benevolently, to Help Mankind, instead of misemploying them, to invent evermore deadly instruments of widespread slaughter. You have only to *regulate* the *Population*, on the one hand, and, on the other, *ensure* the *Production* and *Distribution* of the bounteous gifts of Mother Earth sufficiently and equitably. You will find these gifts more than enough for all. If all the Vast Energy and Labor now being spent on mutual slaughter, and the devastation of the most precious works of Civilisation, were employed scientifically and philanthropically, for the Promotion of the General Welfare of All Mankind, would not the whole surface of the Earth be converted into Heaven, one Immense Garden of Beauty and Delight?

By the terrible motions of your titanic hurtlings, a score of countries, great and small, have been already broken, crushed, subdued, or reduced to helpless submission and

precarious peace with continual drain of vitality. Another score are in violent commotion. Helpless India is being drained, devitalised, placed in dire jeopardy. All these, and all the remaining countries of the earth, are in imminent peril of being plunged in the same bath of blood and fire; are coming nearer and nearer to the edge of the monstrous Malestrom. Japan has been absorbing from you, the evil spirit of imperialist militarism, and, trying to forestal you in China, has been engaged for almost a decade now in trying to subjugate that ancient country, her Elder and her Teacher in every way.

Such are the fearful consequences of your awful War-Madness.

Why will you go on fighting? Have you not hurt each other enough, now? Have you not nearly destroyed London and Berlin, two of the greatest Cities of the modern world? And scores of other fine towns less great than only these? Have you not proved your invincible determination, your indomitable courage, your marvellous organising powers, your scientific genius, your mastery of earth, water, air, sufficiently to each other? You have proved it all, to yourselves and to the world, quite enough. MAKE PEACE, NOW. LET THE U.S.A. BRING ABOUT THE PEACE.

If you go on insisting, "Victory before talk of Peace"—neither will be real victor, ever. Many thoughtful persons of the west, the highest-placed statesmen among them, have said, (as the late Premier of Britain, Earl Baldwin did, on 10-4-1936), that "The next war will be the end of civilisation in Europe... When that war comes to an end, the raging peoples of every country, torn with passion, suffering, horror, would wipe out every Government in Europe; and you would have a state of anarchy from end to end of it as man's protest against wickedness in high places". Yet, doom-driven, all these statesmen in high places, of all countries, prepared for the war, and plunged their countries into it.

"There is a Providence that shapes our ends", and "Destiny makes puppets of us all". The War had to be; in order to produce that Change in the Mass-Mind of the Human Race, without which, "wickedness" will not be deposed from its "high places", *in every country*. But God, in His Mercy, continues to give to the rulers of men, in the high places, chance after chance. Through all the happenings, He calls to them: MAKE PEACE, EVEN NOW. It is not yet too

late. REPENT. Soften your hearts. Show Mercy, even now, to the tortured peoples of the earth ; and you will, even now, receive the Mercy of God which you have long forfeited. An overwhelming victory, to any belligerent, will be fraught with grave danger to all Mankind ; danger from Triumph-maddened despotic Power ; in the present conditions. Therefore it will not be permitted by the Mystery. That Fate, though Mysterious, yet works by plain Psychological Laws. It converts "the cloud no bigger than a man's hand" into the roaring typhoon that thrusts and forces, resistlessly, ever so many brave-looking Ships of State, down, down, into the yawning jaws of Destruction's deeps. The proof is plainly set there, before our eyes. Very carefully, with circumspection and caution infinite, was the Treaty of Versailles drawn up, to make perpetual 'balances of power', and 'buffer-states', and 'encirclements'. Yet all the care, caution, cunning, have been brought to nought—by psychological laws, and facts, viz., uncontrolled, unregulated, Excessive Sensuality, greeds, lusts, arrogances, jealousies, hates, distrusting, fears, betrayals, lies, Selfishnesses of the nations. These are the 'dark and mysterious forces of the Unconscious' ; which yet are things within the consciousness of every-one's everyday experience. Men's Passions and Emotions are the Moving Powers of their Life. The Loving Emotions make for Con-cord and Happiness ; the Hating, for Dis-cord and Misery.

Therefore, this time, with roar of fire and thunder through the rain of bombs from the skies, and the pillars of flame that spring up in response from the blasted towns of sinning men, the Mystery calls insistently :

MAKE PEACE, OR PERISH, ALL OF YOU.

UNITE, OR PERISH.

In every possible sense. *Make Peace*, within each mind, as well as without, between all bodies ; *within Each Nation, between all Classes and Vocations*, as well as *without, between All Nations and all Races*.

You, Great Britain and Great Germany ; You, Great Japan and Great China ; You, Great France and Great Italy ; You, Great U.S.A. and Great Russia—MAKE PEACE between yourselves, and between BRITAIN AND INDIA, and thence all over the Earth.

For, a genuine, sincere, BRITISH-INDIAN COMMON-WEALTH will be the best beginning, the surest foundation, the finest Nucleus, of a WORLD COMMONWEALTH.

Your rulers and leaders have all been speaking of a **NEW WORLD ORDER**. Why not arrange to have that Order *Thought Out*, with open eyes and mind, between the world-rulers, and, much more, between such world-famed Scientists as are also Humanists and Philanthropists? Why continue to have the Old World *Dis-Order Fought Out*, as is being done, blindly, futilely, fatuously? *Rational Social Order, Social Justice within each Nation*, is the *sine qua non* of *Peace between all Nations*. Rational Family Order makes for Rational National Order; Rational National Order makes for Rational International Cosmopolitan World Order. *Organise for Peace*, genuinely, one Nation; and you Organise for Peace, automatically, all Nations. Does not all Common-Sense say that you should **THINK OUT**; and **NOT FIGHT OUT**? Earl Baldwin pointed out the coming Horror; appealed to the **EMOTION** of the public; but, unfortunately failed to appeal to its **REASON** *also*; he could make no constructive proposals for **AVOIDING WORLD WAR BY WORLD ORDER**. But the National Executive of the British Labor Party *did* publish a very useful (though not sufficiently comprehensive) Declaration of Policy, on 9-2-1940. Rather late. If it had been published before the War started; if the British Government had taken it up for serious consideration; and had invited the German and other Governments to join in consultation and discussion; then the War *might have been avoided*. But it is never too late to mend. Now that many Labor leaders are in the British Cabinet, the discussion and Consultation may be started *Now*.

Now that the U.S.A. has, in return for cash and leases, come to the help of Britain, with armament, ships, planes, munitions, if not with men, there is little fear of Britain losing the War. But the Mystery which has created and runs the Universe, seems to have willed that neither Britain nor Germany shall 'win' the war, by any overwhelming martial victory, of either; *but* that, after the mutual destruction of all the militarist elements of *all* the 'Great Powers', and their reduction to 'Power-lessness', Mankind as a whole shall 'win the war against war', by the World-wide uprush of a great **WILL-TO-PEACE, WILL-TO-WORLD-ORDER**. This uprush would occur now, at once, if Britain creates a sincere **BRITISH-INDIAN COMMONWEALTH**. **PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT SHOULD BRING IT TO BIRTH.**

Germany, through the mouth of her Fuhrer Hitler, has

declared (at Munich, on 9 Nov. 1939) that "If Britain started granting her own Empire full liberty by restoring the freedom of India, we should have bowed before her". It is more than high time that this should be done, and the Human World freed from the Horror of the World War now raging in West and East. If Germany should fail to keep her promise, then the 400 millions of India would rise against her as one man, and all the rest of the world would unite to bind Germany down to the promise; it being understood that no country shall claim any compensation from any other, and that each and all will 'cut their losses', in expiation of their own respective past great sins.

India has been the Apple of Discord for rival Imperialisms, for many centuries. The Blessing of Universal Peace, the Heaven of Beauty and Delight, will descend upon earth, only when India, the Mother of Nations, Religions, Civilisations, the Mother who has been fostering all Religions in her Home, for centuries, and been helping the trade of all countries with her Resources for ages—only when India has been raised up from the mud and mire into which she has been dragged down, by the heavy sins, of her own children, as well as those of the children of Britain; is set upon her feet again; is given her due place in a BRITISH-INDIAN COMMONWEALTH and is thereby enabled to pray to the Mystery, in which all things live and move and have their being, to send the Blessing of Universal Peace and Happiness to tortured Humanity.

MAY HIGH GOD GIVE TRUE WISDOM TO ALL
RULERS.

An English-woman's Plea for Peace.

The Reader's Digest (U.S.A.) for October, 1941, publishes an article under the caption, 'Must the World destroy itself—An Englishwoman pleads' (for Peace), by Freda Uteley. An editorial note says that Miss Uteley is "well known as an author and lecturer on three continents, has first-hand knowledge of most of the world's present battle-fronts; as correspondent for the London *News Chronicle*, covered Japan's war against China; lived for six years in Russia, was a Soviet government official in the Comintern, the Commissariat of Foreign Trade, and the Institute of World Economy and Politics; and has graphically described her resulting complete

disillusionment with the Communist Utopia in her recent book, *The Dream We Lost*." The article supports the above Prayer with powerful arguments along other lines.

She discusses at length the prospects of the War, and the possibilities and otherwise of victory, for Britain, and for Germany. She quotes Generals Wavell and Auchinleck to the effect that "The Germans must be beaten on their own soil, exactly the way Napoleon was beaten; and if that is the way it is to turn out, we certainly are going to need *American man-power*, just as we did in the last war". She says there is no evidence that the American people would be willing to undergo the very great self-sacrifice of all kinds that would be needed to send the "gigantic expeditionary force" necessary, "while also keeping England going with war supplies until the war is fought to a finish." She puts her conclusions thus: "The interventionists' assumption is self-contradictory that England *cannot* be invaded by Germany across 22 miles of water, *but* that the U.S.A. *can* be invaded by Germany across 3000 miles of ocean; and that the U.S. *can conquer* Hitler now if she declares war, but that she *cannot defend* herself against him if she does not. The great majority of Americans ask this embarrassing question: If Hitler can invade America across 3000 miles of ocean—why cannot England, which already has the British Navy, and boasts of three million men under arms, invade the Continent of Europe across 22 miles of channel?...The most recent Gallup poll (August 17) has shown that 83 p.c. are opposed to the sending of an American expeditionary force to Europe...Russia had millions of fully trained soldiers right on the German borders, and more planes, tanks, big guns, than the U.S. will have by 1943...Yet all this gigantic armament, all these millions of men, all this aid flung in on Britain's side at the scene of conflict, is not proving sufficient to open the way for a British invasion of the Continent...This war cannot be won by words, or economic blockades, or the building of unlimited numbers of bombing planes; only superior armed might, on the actual field of battle, can overcome the German War machine. Most certainly, England will never be able to do the job alone. Is England then to fight on, at the risk of losing all without hope of total victory?...If England is encouraged by her friends to reject any thought of peace *until Germany is destroyed*, and to risk defeat,...she may yet find herself in France's position—forced to turn *against* her friends in

order to exist. Is not the surest guarantee of America's future safety to be found in a peace which would preserve England's sovereignty and that of her Dominions?...To those who say 'You can't trust Hitler', I say 'Granted—a thousand times'. Instead, we must rely upon our own strength and upon the *superiority* of our own *social* and *economic systems*. A fully armed America and a *reformed* and *rejuvenated* British Empire", (better say, 'British-Indian Commonwealth'—since that is the only form of real re-form-ation and re-juven-ation possible), would be strong enough to maintain the integrity of our territories and spheres of influence... What peace terms can we have? Although the U.S.A. is not in a position to give victory to England, her potential influence is so enormous that by placing herself unequivocally behind Britain, but not insisting on the impossible aim of *freeing* the Continent of Europe *by war*, she could, in all probability, force *Germany to make a peace of equals with Britain*. The common idea that...an American declaration of war would lead to an internal German collapse, is fantastic; but it would seem true that the Germans are sufficiently doubtful of their *ability to win* a war against the U.S.A.—as distinct from their *fear of losing* it—as to make it almost certain than an American offer to mediate peace, on the basis of hands-off-Britain-and-her-Empire, would have such an effect on Germany as to force Hitler to negotiate...So, long as the Nazis can say that *the war goes on because England refuses to make peace*, and that Germans are fighting for their very lives, their hold on the (German) people cannot be weakened...The German people are of the same flesh and blood as ourselves, and must yearn for something else in life besides sacrifices and death, bloody glory, and the hatred of their neighbours...In war, the Nazis go on from strength to strength, for their power is founded upon the emotions which war breeds. Peace might give a chance to other elements in Germany to assert themselves...The last war having resulted in the destruction of democracy over all Europe east of the Rhine, there is an underlying distrust among Americans as to the possibility of saving democracy by once again sacrificing millions of young men in Europe's wars...It is hard to see how our liberal and humanitarian values can survive the aftermath of a long and increasingly bitter war...These qualities cannot long survive a war which demands the same regimentation of men's" (and women's) "bodies and minds as has

been instituted in Nazi Germany ; nor are they likely to survive even a victory which had bled Britain white, destroyed her cities, and created economic problems insoluble by democratic means". (The papers of the last week of November, 1941, report that a million *women* are being 'conscripted' in Britain, for labour in factories and munition-works, to replace the men who are being 'conscripted' for work in the army. 'War knows no scruples', 'Necessity knows no law', 'Needs must when the devil drives'). "The idea was well expressed by the late Lord Lothian: 'The lesson of the last war is that we get neither democracy, nor liberty, nor peace, out of a world war, however noble the end for which it is fought'."

Some comments may be made. "However noble the end"—is very doubtful. Does any one sincerely believe that *any* of the belligerents in the previous World War, or in the present, was, or is, inspired by *any* really noble end? The only real 'noble end' is 'General Human Welfare'. Which of the belligerents *thought*, or *thinks*, of this end? Of course, each one of them, on both sides, *professes* it!

"Peace on the basis of hands-off-Britain-and-her-Empire"—is very short-sighted. Even if secured, it would be futile in any case, except as temporising, opportunist, patchwork. It may create an appearance of peace for a few years. But all far-sighted thinkers of all countries are agreed that only *Collective Peace and Security* can now be permanent peace and security. And, with so many commitments of Britain, especially to Russia, it does not seem *possible*, now, for Britain, to make a *separate* peace with Germany, with the help of even the most recklessly and shamelessly 'diplomatic' somersaults and repudiations. She would be getting entangled very shortly, if not immediately, in other wars, with the jilted countries.

Mr. Churchill, with the frank outspokenness which fails him only now and then, has made it fairly clear, to British as well as Russian and U.S. American critics, that he is conserving the 'man-power' (which is put at three million—armed men, by Miss Utley, but is probably larger), for the final trial of strength, either in Britain, if Germany is able to invade, or in Germany, if a chance offers for it to Britain; but, in any case, after Germany and Russia have both become exhausted, as completely as possible, in their war against each other, while the British keep up 'second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth fronts' in north Africa, the Atlantic, the Mediterranean,

west Asia, east Asia, to distract Germany and her allies, Italy and Japan.

U.S. American unwillingness to enter actively into the war, and disapproval of Britain's efforts to entangle U.S.A. and drag her into it, voiced by Miss Feda Utey, are expressed in active ways also. Thus, "Lord Halifax, (Minister-Ambassador of Britain to U.S.A., ex-Viceroy of India), was pelted with eggs and tomatoes by Women Peace Demonstrators, as he entered a building on Tuesday, 4-11-1941, for a meeting with Archbishop Mooney of Detroit (Michigan, U.S.A.)...The police broke up the demonstration. Lord Halifax is on a two-day tour of Detroit defence centres...The demonstrators, who belong to a group calling themselves 'Mothers of America', were apparently those who picketed Lord Halifax's hotel on Monday, carrying placards, 'Down with England', and 'Halifax is a war-monger'..." (*Hindustan Times*, 6-11-1941).

But Mr. Churchill prefers to shut his eyes to all these signs of the times, ignore the obvious trend of World Opinion in favor of Collective Peace, persevere doggedly in his resolve to 'destroy Hitlerism' and 'maintain British Imperialism', at every possible cost of sacrifice of other peoples, and then his own. The latest achievement of the British Government, in this direction, under his regime, is that Iran has gone the way of Yugo-Slavia and Iraq and the other weak countries which are now under the heel of either Britain or Germany; and Thailand and Turkey are trembling on the brink of the same pit. Abyssinia has, no doubt, been freed at the moment, from the Italian tyranny, by the British, (and Indian soldiers have played a very distinguished and honorable part in the freeing—as acknowledged by the British Ministers); but, if Britain's luck continues to hold good, and her 'imperialistic diplomacy' to succeed, then, very likely, the 'Emperor of Abyssinia' will find himself reduced to the position of the Indian Rajas, Maharajas, Nawabs and Nizam.

As said before, Providence has continued to permit luck and success to Britain, so far—the very greatest good fortune and most successful diplomacy of Britain being the outbreak of war between Germany and Russia—probably because of the remains of Conscience in the mass of the British People, and the possibility of initiating through them, in the shape of a British-Indian Commonwealth, the Great Synthesis of East and West, of the two Hemispheres, of all the Nations, Races, Religions, in a World State and World Religion. But if there

be such a Providence, the Great Mystery, as the vast majority of us reverently believe, and if such be its Way, then, the luck and the success will be taken away from Britain before long, *unless* she realises that 'Honesty is the best Policy', and makes up her mind to *shed* 'Imperialism', and take up Humanism and Humanitarianism, and initiate the Great Synthesis, with the establishment of a British-Indian Commonwealth.

Sir Francis Younghusband's Wise Counsel to the British Government.

The London *Times*, 15-10-1941, published the following letter from Sir Francis Younghusband, (K. C. S. I., Lt.-Colonel, soldier, explorer, author):—

"We have blundered badly in India. While we have expressed our intention to free every other country, we have made special reservations about liberating India. And this has caused the deepest resentment among Hindus and Muslims alike...It goes against the grain with Englishmen to keep a single human being within the Empire who is not proud to belong to it. To myself personally, who was born in India, (in 1863), and have, for the last 59 years, been closely connected with Indians, it comes as a bitter reproach that we should treat Indians as anything else than most loyal comrades and affectionate friends...Trust an Indian, and he will stick to you until death...Surely we are a great enough people to stop niggling over this matter and do the big and gracious thing—Give them a definite promise, that the very year after the armistice, we will leave it to them to decide whether or not they wish to remain within the Empire. A hundred reasons may be given against this.' But if there were a thousand, they should step aside, by the single consideration—the Good Name of England. It may 'lose' us India, but we shall have gained our own soul. And the soul of England is worth many Indias".

"What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, but lose his own soul?"; whereas, if a man gain his own soul, he will gain the whole world also. The true soul is the just and generous soul; and such a soul makes friends of the world as a whole, though a few 'evil souls' may continue to be hostile here and there. If Britain gives India her freedom, i.e., genuine Dominion Status within a

British-Indian Commonwealth, Britain will *not* 'lose' India, but 'gain' her much more firmly and permanently, because she will gain her body-and-soul, head-and-heart. India can *no* more *do without* Britain, than Britain can without India. All wise far-sightedness and deep-sightedness cries aloud, therefore, that they should *do with* each other in *mutual affection* and *inter-dependence*; *not* in mutual hostility and mastery-and-dependence.

"Sir Francis Younghusband, writing again in the *Times*, (25-10-1941), replies to his critics, particularly Sir Alfred Knox, who had asked Sir Francis how he proposed that 'it should be decided what India really wants'. He writes: 'It is not my business. It is the business of Indians. And Indians, as I have already said, are no fools. Mr. Amery has announced that the new constitution would be framed by Indians themselves, and not by us. That is the line to follow', for Mr. Amery and the British Government, sincerely, honestly, in *practice*; *not* diplomatically, in *promise* and *profession* only; with diligent working of '*divide et impera*' methods all the while. Sir Francis must have meant this, and might well have added it, plainly, to avoid mistaken misinterpretations.

With Sir Francis' short and sweet, and at the same time, completely cogent and conclusive, reply, to Sir Alfred Knox, the reader may compare the Suggestion made here, at pp. 14-15 and 247-248 above. Sir Alfred Knox may also be asked what sort of *over-lordship* he thinks desirable for Europe, to keep in check the vast 'political riots' of British-German-French-Russian-Italian, etc., if he thinks British overlordship necessary to check the 'communal riots' of Hindus and Muslims in India. For Sir Francis' answer to this larger question, see p. 70, *supra*.

*The Universal Craving for Religion,
and the Necessity for a Universal Religion,
which will reconcile all Religions.*

Quotations from a British author of note, (pp. 129, 395-6, 400, *supra*), have shown that the need for 'spiritual guidance', the craving for and the clinging to religion, is common to Briton and German alike; especially to the youth of both the peoples. It is also common knowledge that the 'officialised' Churchian Christianity fails to satisfy the educated modern mind in the west. One has also repeatedly read statements made

in the British and U.S.A. dailies, monthlies, and books, that Communism is a 'religion' now in Russia, i.e., inspires the same fervour of feeling that 'religion' (other-worldly) does; and that the portraits of Lenin and Stalin are 'worshipped' in many peasant homes in the absence of the old ikons; also that Fascism and Nazism are, similarly, the 'religion' of Italy and Germany, now, respectively. Mr. Maisky's recent statement of the Russian position has been quoted before. The following extracts will throw further light on the matter, in respect of Germany.

Abridged Extract from the monthly 'Memorandum of Information', (Aug., 1939) ¹

"Too many people think of Hitler as a somewhat vulgar adventurer, who has had uncommonly good luck.. For this view there is no foundation whatsoever. It is the product of propaganda or wishful thinking.

"The main objectives of German foreign policy are the humiliation of the Western Powers and the domination of Eastern Europe, so that eventually Germany can take the place which Great Britain and the Imperial Commonwealth have occupied for so long; and the *Nazi Religion*, the place of the Christian faith. These objectives are sacred and unalterable. They are the very life-blood of the Nazi movement.. To replace the *Christian Religion* as a vital force in *World affairs* is as important to Herr Hitler as territorial expansion... While the Communist doctrine is anti-religious, Nazi teaching is only anti-Christian, and definitely substitutes for the Christian religion, an alternative *faith*, in which, curiously enough, the *Sacraments* of the Church are *counterfeited*. There is something *desperately sinister* in this... *Meetings of German minorities* in foreign countries are often conducted on the lines of a *religious assembly*; a reading from the *Mein Kampf* takes the place of a lesson from the *Holy Scriptures*; a process of *thought-concentration* upon the Führer *counterfeits* an act of *prayer*; and so on. That this may all have an exceedingly important relation to the widest and most far-reaching political questions in Europe, none can doubt... We are dealing, not so much with a political force (in Germany), not so much with a Military Power, as with an extremely subtle, most effective, Religious Movement, which is led by a prophet who has an

¹Published by The Imperial Policy Group, 13, Old Queen Street, London, S.W.1.; edited by Kenneth de Courcy.

incredible power over men and women...The most sober-minded officials of the most unimaginative Government (of Britain) are all coming to the same conclusion—that the *German problem* is *as much* a *religious* one as it is *political* and *military*. A Committee of Englishmen, who have been rooted and grounded in the conventions, do not willingly publish such a report. It is only overwhelming evidence that makes it necessary to do so...The cold-blooded citizen of the west may disbelieve these reports if he will, but, before long, the appalling truth will be apparent...To understand the Führer's outlook and form any accurate judgment of German intentions, we must...(remember) that these objectives were not envisaged in a moment of great triumph, nor after some stupendous stroke of luck...The policy was written down by Herr Hitler's own hand when he was in prison, just after one of the greatest defeats in his political career, when almost everything was against him, and he was not even within sight of power in his own country...Since then, incredible though it is, many of these objectives have been attained..All the world is talking, thinking, planning, in terms of Hitler".

It should be noted that the above statements were published in August, 1939, and the present War began on 1-9-1939. Every religion, old or new, has its 'prophet, its 'holy book', its 'prayer-meetings', its 'thought-concentration', etc.; compare the credos and the practices of the Jesuits, the Rosicrucians, the Freemasons, the Mormons, the Bahais, and *all* the old and new sects of East and West. New ones are appearing every month in India. As Germany has a prophet in Hitler, and a Bible in *Mein Kampf*, which propounds a clearly defined Objective, a Plan and a Programme; so has Russia, in Stalin, and in Marx' and Lenin's writings; Italy, in Mussolini, and his pronouncements; Britain, in the Cabinet, especially the Prime Minister, and Imperialist and Mammonist Patriotism. Britain's prophet and bible are less individualised, specified, concentrated, because her *need* has not been acute at all; on the contrary, she has been growing stronger and wealthier, steadily, for many decades, until the previous Great War; Turkey's prophet was Kemal Ataturk while he lived; Iran's, Reza Shah, now vanished from the scene, with kaleidoscopic rapidity, (and said to be practically a prisoner somewhere in Mauritius); China's is Chiang-Kai-Shek, and the writings of Dr. Sun Yat Sen; and so on and so forth.

All great 'movements', all groups which are impelled by real need and distress, or are urged by intense ambition of some kind, and *strive* to advance towards their objective, indispensably need 'Faith', as *source* of 'Power', in a 'Leader', a 'Prophet', a 'Commander', and in an 'Ideal', a 'Doctrine', a 'Dogma'. India has always had many and often contemporaneous and 'rival' prophets, (most 'prophets' have had and have such 'rivals', because of the Law of Polarity); and, at the present time, India's most outstanding, most revered, most followed, prophet is obviously Mahatma Gandhi, and equally clearly he is a philanthropic and saintly person, whatever else he may or may not be. He has, so far, not been able to put forth any such 'Bible' as the others have done. The one he did put forward, viz., *Hind Swaraj*, has not caught on, (see p. 333, *supra*). This lack of a 'Bible', a specific Scheme of Swaraj, a Draft Constitution for India, embodying a Social Structure, appealing and acceptable to the vast majority, if not everybody—this has been the great stumbling-block in the way of the Congress and the country. But, as the letters from Mahatma-ji, printed at the close of this chapter, will show, he will very probably be able to supply this great lack effectively, before long. It is fervently hoped by this writer that the collection of views made in this book, may be of some little service to him, and to other leaders in this country, in drafting a Constitution which will adequately combine the fundamentals of World Order and World Religion.

The world is such an infinite jumble of contradictions, such an intricate mixture of Good and Evil, that, for one true prophet, there are a hundred false prophets. The Quran, the Bible, the Upanishats, all warn us against the latter. But men and unfortunately women, continue to be deceived, because of their pathetic weaknesses of heart and head, their excessive selfishnesses, fears, desires of many kinds, and inability to distinguish truth from error. Even the chevaliers *sans peur et sans reproche* have their weak moments. Even criminals perform grand deeds now and then. Even Rama, 'the standard Man,' descended a few inches from the highest standard half-a-dozen times, and left behind him occasion for questioning, to proving his own 'humanity', and to stimulate thought and self-dependence in the students of his noble life. Even Ravana was a great monarch and benefactor of his own people. The great poet of the *Mahā-bhārata* makes it clear

that good and evil were intermixed, on the side of the Pāndavas as well as of the Kauravas, the cousins who fought out that Great War to a finish ; though the Pāndavas had more good on their side, and the Kauravas more evil. Kṛṣṇa himself sided with the Pāndavas, but *permitted* his own army to fight on behalf of and side by side with the Kauravas, against the Pāndavas and against himself. There can be little doubt that Hitler is a 'soul' of very extra-ordinary power ; whether he incarnates the forces of Goodness and Light, or of Evil and Darkness, or, as is most prabable, elements of both, a sort of Janus, of Jekyll-Hyde—this, only future historians will decide, who may be able to look at the present times, more disinterestedly and impartially. Hitler has, patently, inspired Faith in the German People, the Faith which can move mountains But the same, though in lesser degree, may be said of the other great leaders of the nations, dictators, prime ministers, presidents, etc., who are the other central figures of current history ; and who are such central figures only because of the Faith they have succeeded in inspiring. Faith is the steam-power. Human beings, to escape danger, to gain desired objects, will attach their faith to stocks and stones, amulets and mascots, pictures and names of prophets and leaders, to false prophets and mis-leaders, to flags and symbols, to national songs and patriotic slogans, to the names of books which they cannot even read, much less understand—rather than go without all faith. The child must cling to some elder's fingers. Step by step, the human soul rises to the supreme Faith which is the Culmination of Reason also, viz., Faith in it-Self ; the Ultimate Faith in the Identity of the Individual self with the Universal Self, the Principle of Omnipresent Life and Consciousness.

The Sole and single Purpose of this book is to show that Religion and Civilisation, Spiritual Bread and Material Bread, Emotional-Aspirational Faith and Intellectual-Physical Activity, Heart and Head-Limbs, steam-power and wheeled machinery, go together ; and that, so far, in Human History, as known to the west, there has been no Conscious Integration of the two ; as there ought to be. 'Religion' has been largely superstition, i.e., Faith without Reason ; and 'Civilised Science' has been largely Materialism, which is pseudo-Reason without Faith. The two have been kept apart. Sunday clothes and Week-day clothes have been locked up in separate boxes. But they have been acting, reacting, interacting, un-

avoidably, powerfully, inevitably, even though sub-consciously. The time has come now, with the great advances in both Scientific and Religious Thought (in the shape of the 'Philosophic Principles of Science', and 'higher criticism' and 'Comparative Religion'), for a Synthesis of the two by Philosophic or Metaphysical Thought. The Sciences of the Finite have to be co-ordinated by the Science of the Infinite; 'Nationalisms', by 'Humanism'; individual selves, by the Universal Self. Politics has to be inspired and permeated by Ethics strong-based on Psychics (Psychology) and Metaphysics. The Sunday clothes have to become Week-day clothes also. The things of the Flesh have to be seen to, very carefully and assiduously; but to be seen with the eyes of the Spirit. Life, Individual and Collective, has to be governed by Science which must be Religious, and by Religion which must be Scientific. Emotion has to become Rational, and Reason has to become Emotional. So only can Human Life attain the peaks of Refinement and Happiness. It is claimed that such Synthesis, such Integration, has been achieved in the Ancient Indian Social Organisation.

This does not mean that *every* human being, and all human beings, at once, must, simultaneously and consciously become Rationally Religious and Religiously Rational. Children cannot be expected to be at the same mental level as patriarchs of families. It is enough that the *heads*, the *leaders*, should have attained Wisdom, i.e., Knowledge *plus* Philanthropy. Then all the families will prosper exceedingly in unison.

Such is the Thesis of this book. For the New Civilisation, a New World Order and a New (yet Eternally Old) World Religion are needed; a Religion which will not dream of abolishing and annihilating any old religion, but will reconcile, liberalise, synthesise, refine and elevate all, by rational interpretation, and by emphasis on the Common Core, so far not duly recognised and realised; but, instead, very largely neglected, ignored, and even denied; and a World Order which will not violently upset the life of any people, but will regulate, equitabilise, and reconcile all sections, all occupations, all interests, *within* each people, and thereby reconcile all peoples; will not try to abolish any sovereignty, but will abolish their in-dependent separate-ness, and will co-ordinate them into equal inter-dependence; will not annihilate any nationalism and nationality, but will make them all equally

subordinate to Humanism and Humanity. The fundamental principles of such an integrated World Order and World Religion, as laid down by Indian tradition, have been set forth above, in ch. xiv.

A very important Corollary of the Thesis is that the sooner this mutually pervasive World Religion and World Order is thought and planned out by the wisest minds, representative of *all* nations, the better it will be for mankind. To wait till *after* the war, till after one or another belligerent has won 'Victory' over the other or others will be *fatal*. A New World Order, then planned by the victor, will mean only a new alignment of political boundaries, a re-drawing of the world's map, at the will, and for the glory and omni-potence, of the Victor; will only create the conditions for a yet worse grinding of the weaker peoples; for a yet worse Armageddon. It will not mean a Re-ad-just-ment, a *just* arrangement, of Relations, of Rights-and-Duties, between the several sections, occupational groups, interests, *within*, each nation, and therefore *between* all nations.

Powerful light, on the acute need for careful consideration of this thesis, is thrown by the above extract from the monthly Memorandum of Information. Pages 119-120, *supra*, of this book, may also be again glanced at in this connection.

President Roosevelt on the Nazi Religion.

As up-to-date comment, on the extract made above from the *Memo : of Information*, may be noted the following :

"In a speech at the Navy Day banquet, on 27-10-1941, Pt. Roosevelt said: '...I have, in my possession, a secret map, made by Hitler's Government—planners of the New World Order—...of South America and part of Central America, as Hitler proposes to re-organise it;...(also) another document made by Hitler's Government, a plan to *abolish* all existing religions—Protestant, Catholic, Mahommedan, Hindu, Buddhist, Jewish alike...In place thereof...there is to be set up an international Nazi Church ..served by orators sent out by the Nazi Government ..*Mein Kampf* will be imposed as Holy Writ. In place of the Cross of the Christ will be put—the Swastika and the naked Sword. The God of Blood and Iron will take the place of the God of Love and Mercy...';" (*Hindustan Times*, 29-10-1941).

The line which separates Shiva from Rudra, Gaurī from Kālī, Al-Ghaffār from Al-Qahhār, the smile from the frown, the gentle smile of benevolence from the cruel smile of gloating

triumph, the tender from the murderous gleam in the eye, the Janus of Peace from the Janus of War, love from lust, the healthful secretion from the toxic and septic excretion, the God of Mercy from the God of Fury—is a geometrical line which has length without breadth. Yet it is a *very positive* line. A New World Order *is* wanted—but of *what sort?* A New World Religion *is* wanted—but of *what sort?* The whole of this book is an endeavour to answer these questions—in terms of the old, old, Thought of India's past great Rshis, Sages and Seers. The Cross as understood by the established Christian Churches, and, presumably, by Pt. Roosevelt, has brought no more peace to the world than the Swastikā, as understood, apparently, by Hitler, is likely to. The Scholars who identify the Swastika with the Cross, also identify it with the Hammer of Thor; which seems to be the interpretation put upon it by the mind of Hitler; and we may also remember that the Hammer and the Sickle are the sign of the Soviet too, the Sickle being only another 'aspect' of the Sword, which Hitler, according to Roosevelt, places beside the Swastika. It may be noted, by the way, that antiquarians, archeologists, and students of comparative mythology and religion are agreed that Swastika and Cross are to be found all over the earth, in all times, climes, races, and that the Cross is the stationary Swastika, and the Swastika is the whirling Cross; whirling to the right, clock-wise, with the 'flames' blowing backwards, it is the positive, the sign of White Magic; to the left, the negative, the sign of Black Magic; which again illustrates how closely Light and Dark, Love and Lust, Spirit and Matter, Soul and Body, are connected. In Black Magic, the leftward Cross and Swastika become symbols of Phallic worship; in White, the rightward are symbols of the Holy Power of Mental Creation, Ideation.

O ! wad some god the giftie gie us,

To see oursels as ithers see us ! (Burns).

"Not even in *Nazi Germany* has the myth of the sacred mission of a super-race to impose its rule and philosophy upon other peoples become so dominant and therefore so dangerous a factor in national life as in Japan. By inherited traditions, by a rationalized philosophy, by religious sanctions, by absolutely controlled education and propaganda, further stimulated by the urge of gain and glory and by the circumstance of having never yet experienced sobering defeat, this consciousne

animates the entire nation, and justifies the cruelties of unprovoked invasion as well as the aggravation of their own economic or other hardships, which are regarded by them as sacrifices in a noble cause. It is the naïve sincerity of this conviction which makes of it such a deadly menace...The undoubted tinge of idealism which prompted this adventure makes more poignantly significant its outcome to date. For all Manchuria gives the impression of a vast prison camp. The Chinese, long since disarmed and herded in the country into designated and heavily guarded villages, registered and controlled by every device imitative of German thoroughness, are cowed and listless in demeanour. Instead of the cheery smiling patience which has been recognized as characteristic even of the poorest among them, their faces now have bleak apathy expressive of suffering, injustice, and the hopelessness of their outlook."

The above is quoted out of a cabled extract from a British daily, published in the *Statesman* (Calcutta) of 18. 2. 1941. Did it ever strike the British writer to try to judge whether the description applies, and to what extent, to the Britain of the last four centuries in her dealings with 'colored' peoples? Indeed, it covers the mood, the theory, the practice, with variations of degree, no doubt, of every 'conquering race', all down the stream of time. Compare the sayings and doings of 'Aryan' Brahmanas and Kshattriyas, 'gods on earth', 'descended from sun and moon'; Jews, 'the chosen of Jehovah'; Egyptians and Assyrians, who made slaves of the Jews; Persians, who called the Greeks and the Romans, 'barbarians', and made of Valerian, the captured Roman Emperor, a living footstool for Shapoor, 'king of kings', to mount his horse by; the Greeks and Romans, who repaid the compliment, by calling the Persians, 'barbarians'; down to our own times of 'the white man's burden' and his 'civilising mission', through the slave-trade in negroes, the extermination, subjugation, enslavement, of the Amer-indians and other 'colored' tribes, by Spaniards, Portuguese, British, Dutch, Belge, and latterly, German and Italian, with 'national songs' of 'Deutschland uber alles' of the 'Nordic blonde man', and 'Britannia rules the waves' of the 'Anglo-Saxon man', etc.; whence, of course, 'the mission of the Japan man', now, after a sleep of twenty-five centuries (excepting the short conquest-outbursts of Hideyoshi and Iyeyasu).

The *Hindustan Times*, 30-3-1941, reprinted an article, headed 'Matsuoka's Mission', from the London *Times*. The

article said : "...Japan's main objective is and remains the conquest of China. Tokyo calculates that the two countries would form a large economic bloc...The millions of square miles of rich Chinese soil would provide Japan with food and materials. Her immense mineral resources would be at the disposal of Tokyo. The 450 million Chinese subjects would be exploited and harnessed to Japanese industry. A conquered China would be a market of immense possibilities for Japanese goods and investments..."

Did the writer ever stop to think that Britain and London have *already* done with India and her 350 millions, what, he says, Japan and Tokyo *wish* to do with China and her 450 millions? Of course, let us repeat once more, India is eating the bitter fruit of her own sins of fissiparous separatism and internal vices and dissensions; while China is drawing upon her reserves of virtue to counteract the consequences of her sins, and to resist Japanese aggression.

Scientists to the Rescue.

The Reader's Digest (New York), for March 1941, published an article entitled, 'The Shape of Every Day Things to Come'. The first sentence is : "What sort of world lies just ahead, if things that already exist in the laboratory can be brought into everyday life? Let us begin with the most familiar of all environments—the home".

Then follows a description of wonders, which, the article vouches, living working scientists *declare positively* that *they can realise* on the large scale, as they *have realised* on the small scale in their laboratories. The article ends with the following :—

"At this point some one may ask : 'How are these things to be realized in a world where people are killing each other in senseless wars?' Scientists are well aware that, unless we can overcome the present lag between the mind of the technologist and that of some political leaders, the future looks grim. Yet even on this matter they offer some hope. Enormous strides have been made in recent decades in the understanding of the *psychology*, both of the individual and the crowd. Today, scientists are beginning to understand the mass *impulse to be ruled* by some one, which makes a population accept a dictator—to understand it and to know how to prevent it...The scientists are keenly aware of the immediate dangers in today's world. At the recent Conven-

tion of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, I listened to outstanding leaders testify to the role that technology and the scientific discipline must play in reclaiming our civilization. As one speaker put it, *science* has got into the hands of the *ape-men*, and it must be restored to the representatives of humanity. Practical proposals were made there, to keep alive the last dying embers of the scientific spirit in Europe, and to make sure that in America scientific progress and the democratic way of life go hand in hand''.

This is very hopeful. The sentiments expressed by some scientists, at the more recent Conference of Scientists in London, (see pp. 444-450, *supra*), were similar in implication, though worded much more mildly and cautiously, as was natural, in a town which had been devastated by aerial bombing, and was expecting more attacks any day. Compare with the above extract, the Appeal to the Scientists (pp. 432-444, *supra*). In 1937, a book was published with the title, *Human Affairs*. It is a symposium, of fifteen specialist scientists' views. Dr. R. B. Cattell and two others have edited it. Ch. I, 'Editorial', begins thus: "This work bears witness to a new movement that is stirring the thought of social scientists everywhere. There has been a new awakening of responsibilities; a keener realisation has dawned of the nature of the potent forces that direct our lives. To control these forces is the most urgent need of our age. *Scientists* stand *aghast*, witnessing the *prostitution* of their work to the baser impulses of man. They begin to see...that it is leading us to a cataclysm whose horror we can only conjecture. They *perceive* now *fully*, for the *first* time, the immediate bearing of their discoveries upon the workings of modern life. They realise that these discoveries have transformed social life without solving any social problems; that, indeed, they have multiplied economic, biological, and psychological difficulties. No wonder, then, that they seek at once to safeguard their work from the blunders of the incompetent and the heedless, and the grip of the psychopathic and the criminally selfish". The Scientists are waking up rather late. The cataclysm has begun. Also, the scientists of the west still think too much in terms of Matter and Machinery. There was, perhaps still is, a movement in U.S.A. for what was named 'Technocracy'. It proposed to solve all human problems by means of external technical devices and machinery; as 'statesmen'

endeavour to solve the problem of 'majority-minority representation' by means of arithmetical devices. There have been other 'mechanical' schemes, like Silvio Gessell's 'Free Money' Scheme, and the 'Douglas Scheme', etc. They all are lacking in the indispensable *psychological* foundations; and hence are failures, all of them.

A 'Committee on Science and Its Social Relations' of the 'International Council of Scientific Unions', was instituted in 1937, with Secretariat at Delft (Holland). This writer had some correspondence with them in 1938-1939, with reference to 'The Appeal to Scientists'. But the war started; and the correspondence stopped.

It is the Fate of Man, to be wise *after* the event. He is always a little too late. Were it otherwise, the work of Māyā would be finished, and the World-Process would repose eternally in the Profound Slumber and Peace of Pralaya-Chaos! But 'better late than never'; 'we must hope to do better next time'; 'hope is the great sustainer'; and 'Pain is the Great Teacher, without whose spur and whip, man would not move from Ignorance to, first, the partial and lower knowledge, and then to the Final Knowledge, from Avidyā to Viḍyā, from Slavery (to Matter) to Freedom (of the Spirit).

Need to Regulate Population.

"Galton (the modern initiator of the study of the Science of Eugenics) said, 'Eugenics rests on bringing no more individuals into the world than can be properly cared for, and those, only of the Best Stocks'. That is to say, the only instrument by which Eugenics can be made practically effective in the modern world is Birth-Control...Eugenics and Birth-Control need to be *embodied* in our *instinctive impulses*. Galton considered that *Eugenics* must become a factor of *Religion*, and be regarded as a sacred and virile creed; while Ellen Key holds that the religions of the past must be superseded by a New Religion, which will be the awakening of the whole of Humanity to a consciousness of the 'Holiness of Generation'... Eugenics and Birth-Control certainly need to go far deeper than mere intelligence. The demands of the race must speak from *within* us, in the voice of *Conscience*. When that happens with regard to ascertained Laws of Social Well-being, we may know that we are truly following...those great spirits, like Galton with his Intellectual Vision and Ellen Key with her Inspired Enthusiasm, who have pointed out new roads

for the ennoblement of the Race'' ; (abridged extract from Havelock Ellis, *Little Essays on Love and Virtue*, Essay on 'The Individual and the Race').

How the ideas of Eugenics and Birth Control ; of what are the Best Stocks ; of what different sorts of them are needed for a Complete Society ; of way they can be promoted—how these ideas have been made instinctive, part of Conscience, part of Religion, in the Indian Scheme of Society—this will be clear to those who ponder on the full significance of the words Brahma-charya (continence), Kāma-Shāstra (the Science of Eros-Love, which includes Eugenics, not only physiological but also psychological), and Dwi-ja (twice-born, regenerate, of three types). The *real significance* of that worship, which has become grossly perverted into 'phallus-worship', Bacchanalian orgies, Black Magic (*Vāma-Tantra*, 'left-hand', 'sinis-ter') practices—is the worshipful reverent realisation of the Holiness of the Creative Power ; the Power which creates primarily by Ideation (*mānasa-sṛṣṭi* by *Ichchhā-Sankalpa*, *khilqat* by *khayāl* and *ṭasawwur*) ; and, secondarily, after 'the fall of Adam and Eve from Eden, and their clothing themselves with *skins*', i. e., after the descent of ethereal souls into the *em-bodi*-ment of denser matter, and the shapes of different-sexed men and women, creates a new living being by the union of man and woman. In the Védic (Hindu) Scriptures, suggestions and instructions are given, as part of Essential Religion, for the reverent as well as loving and glad (*sāttvika*) use of this 'power of creation of new life', vouchsafed by Nature to the human being ; use on the physical plane, within the limits of sanctified (*sāttvika*) Marriage, as well as the mental plane, within the limits of benevolent, philanthropic, (*sāttvika*) purpose ; see pp. 372-3, 512-3, of *The Essential Unity of All Religions*) ; and warnings are also given, against the misuse of the power and the consequent production of evil physical progeny, as well as of evil mental progeny, (see pp. 75-6, 79-80, *supra*). The new western methods of, and devices for, contra-ception, may not be mentioned in these Scriptures, (—it must be remembered that a great deal of Samskr̥t Vedic and Buddhist literature has been lost, and fragments are being recovered, here and there, every now and then—) ; but various medical means are mentioned in the works on Āyur-vēda ; and there is nothing in those Scriptures, so far as this writer's very limited and imperfect reading shows, which would

prohibit the use of tried and tested new 'scientific' methods; but always *within* the bounds of the *marital life*; for lustful use of them, *outside* the sacred bounds of permanent union of one man and one woman, is *psychologically* as well as *physiologically*, and *socially*, more disastrous in the long run, than even over-population; it will lead to orgic madness, nerve-disease, and other diseases, on a vast scale, and make of the world one huge Bedlam, worse than it is at present.

An Interview with Mahatma Gandhi.

The present writer had the privilege of an interview, (referred to at p. 353, *supra*), with Mahatma Gandhi, in Benares, on 9th January, 1927. He put to Mahatma-ji some questions which had been greatly exercising his mind for some seven years already. He had put them to Mahatma-ji, in writing, and also orally, now and then, before too; but this time he was able to do so, more specifically, at the leisure of Mahatma-ji; and so to elicit corresponding answers. The interview was published in the Hindi *Āj* (Benares) of 19-2-1927, after proofs had been shown to Mahatma-ji; and in English translation in other papers. It is reproduced in full below; but the larger portion of the Note appended to it has been omitted; as also the Reasons for the Resolutions proposed for the Gauhati Session (1926) of the I. N. Congress. These proposed Resolutions, however, are given here in full. This whole book supplies the reasons much more amply.

"B.D.: (Question.) Mahatma-ji, I wish very much to know what you think of certain measures which seem to me very helpful, or indeed indispensable, for the welfare and progress of India, in political as well as other respects. I have been trying my feeble best to place them before the public for the last six years, but more or less in vain. If they could secure your approval, the country would look at them with more consideration, and might attempt to put them into operation, for the force of your *tapasyā* (asceticism and self-denial) is very great, and the country rightly places great faith in you, because of your great selflessness. I put these measures into the form of Proposals for Resolutions, and requested my dear friend, Shri Shiva Prasad Gupta, to try to get them placed before the Gauhati Congress (which I could not attend). But nothing more could be done than to place copies in the hands of the members of the A. I. Congress

Committee. With your permission I will put the same in the form of questions to you.

1. First of all, do you think, or not, that the essence of true Swa-raj, true Self-government, is that all the laws should be made by the elected representatives of the people, and that these elected representatives should embody the *Higher Swa* or *Self*, and not the lower self, of the people; that is to say, they should be the wisest, the most experienced, the most unselfish and philanthropic persons available?

Mahatma Gandhi: (Answer.) This also is among the essential features.

2. Q. What other essential features are there, if any?

A. My ideal is that every person should realize Dharma. In that case, there will be no need left for any representatives. That is the ideal Swaraj. There are no rulers and no ruled in that Swa-raj; no governmental servants; all are the servants of all. This is the ideal Swa-raj. If this ideal Swaraj is kept in view, mistakes would be avoided, or, at least, minimised. It is certain that such ideal Swa-raj can never be attained; but we will be able to make a near approach to it.

3. Q. This is no doubt the highest kind of Swa-raj. Apparently the Republic of the Uttara-Kuru-s described in the *Mahā-bhārata*, was something like this.¹ But the inhabitants of that happy land were all super-men and super-women, god-and-goddess-like *Jivan-mukta-s* and *Yoga-siddha-s*, perfect, final, men and women, *insān-ul-kāmil*, *marq-wa-zan-i-tamām*, ("Be ye perfect, even as your Father in Heaven is perfect"), according to the tradition of that epic. In view, obviously, of our present condition, however, you yourself said at the Ahmedabad Congress, of 1921, that you could lead this country to only Dominion Home Rule. Would not that be the preliminary or intermediate form of Swa-raj which would be suitable for us now?

A. Yes.

4. Q. There must be legislatures in such Swaraj?

A. Yes.

5. Q. Representatives would have to be elected for them?

A. Yes.

6. Q. These representatives should be the wisest, most experienced, most selfless, most philanthropic persons available?

¹The ideal of philosophic An-arch-ism, and of Marxian Communism, is the same; (see p. 465, *supra*).

A. Yes.

7. Q. Electors should always keep this ideal, this guiding principle, in view ?

A. Yes.

8. Q. Should this guiding principle be followed in making elections for District Boards, Municipal Boards, and other local elective bodies, as well as for the Congress Committees of all grades ?

A. Certainly.

9. Q. Is this guiding principle recognised by, is this ideal spread among, the Indian public ?

A. To some extent.

10. Q. Looking at the elections made to the Congress Committees and the various elective bodies, what inference can we draw as to the extent to which this principle is recognised and acted on ? Is the extent very small, or sufficient ?

A. It is less than it ought to be.

11. Q. This same principle should guide the elections to the legislative bodies, should it not ?

A. It should guide all the elections that are made now-a-days.

12. Q. Has sufficient effort been made, by leaders, individually, or by the Congress, as a body, to spread this ideal among the public ?

A. It would not be enough to say yes or no in reply to this question. I believe that the present atmosphere is not favourable for this purpose.

13. Q. You said before that the principle had been recognised to some extent by the public. What was the cause of the spread of the ideal to that small extent ?

A. So far the effort has been individual. When the atmosphere becomes favourable, then all persons begin to act according to such ideals without any effort.

14. Q. Should effort be made to create such a favourable atmosphere or not ?

A. It should be made unceasingly.

15. Q. What kind of effort would be helpful ?

A. The number of the individuals who make this effort should increase constantly. And there is, and has always been, only one way to bring about this increase, viz., that those who believe in this ideal should cling to it in the face of all difficulties.

16. Q. That is to say, individuals should spread the ideal by teaching and preaching, in speech and writing?

A. Individuals should preach by the example of their conduct. Speeches and writings are also of help. Conduct includes speaking and writing.

17. Q. I entirely agree that preaching has no force if the preacher does not act up to his own advice. But while you have been putting on Khaddar and working the Charkha yourself, you have also, side by side, with the setting of this personal example, been preaching them very extensively and very diligently. And that is why they are spreading. So too you have been preaching assiduously and widely, various measures connected with non-violent non-co-operation. Do you not think that, in this very important matter also, it is very necessary to give advice to and remind the public persistently, as thus: "Whenever you have to elect representatives, you should elect persons of such-and-such qualifications"? Without such advice, will not the general public remain in darkness, without any guide, in this exceedingly important matter?

A. This question is right. But really the answer to it is included in my previous answer. I regard advising and preaching as part of conduct generally. I do not give a separate place to precept, because, when a person cannot set a good example his precept is useless, and often becomes harmful. And he who keeps his conduct right, does as a fact give advice also whenever there is an opportunity.

18. Q. But so far as I am aware, you have not advised the Indian public, as yet, in your speeches and writings, as to the qualifications they should look for in the persons they elect?

A. Not once but many times have I given this advice, in speech and writing.

19. Q. Should I find it in *Young India*?

A. Yes.

20. Q. I will search.¹ In the meanwhile, will you very

¹I might have suggested to Mahatma-ji, here, that the mere fact, that I needed to search for them, that the public was *not* familiar with his teachings on this very important point, and was not acting in accord with them, while it was, as regards charkha and khadi—this fact indicated that there was great need for much greater publicity. But I failed to make that suggestion, here. The subsequent question (no. 24), however, serves the purpose.

kindly tell me, what means should be employed, what rules followed, to secure properly qualified representatives? So far as I can see, the general complaint is that the representatives chosen are not of the right quality, either in the self-governed countries of the west, or in present-day India under the new election-system. This is the one chief and serious defect in current systems of self-government, is it not?

A. And this is the strong reason why I strongly oppose Council entry. So long as the people do not realise "Swa-ṭva" (i. e. spirituality), so long as their intelligence is not awake, so long it will not be possible to secure purity in elections by any laws. And this purity has a large part in my present efforts. From the very beginning my endeavour has been directed towards the increase of the power, the soul-force, of the people, by self-purification and *ṭapasyā* (self-denial, self-sacrifice, asceticism, *rīyāzāt*, *naḥs-kushī*). By such *ṭapasyā*, their intelligence will be purified and rectified. Because of this, the persons who were elected for Municipal Boards, etc. after the commencement of the non-co-operation movement, were good persons, and they were elected without trouble and expense. When that atmosphere disappeared, confusion began.

21. Q. By the ancient tradition of this land, *ṭapasyā* and *vidyā* (right spiritual knowledge, *ilm*, *mā'rīfat*) are two distinguishable, though more or less interdependent, things; and only by the combination of both is achieved that true humanity, true spirituality, or realisation of God, or Self, or Brahman, or Allah, or Brāhmanahood, or Kamāl, however it may be called, which is what I believe you mean by Swa-ṭva (Self-ness). In the Purāṇic story we read that Rāvaṇa and others made great *ṭapasyā*, but the result of that was tyrannical earthly power and excessive luxury to them, for some time, and groaning to the rest of the world. They made *ṭapasyā* without *vidyā*. What I feel is that in the atmosphere created by the N.C.O., there was the element of *ṭapasyā*, but not of *vidyā*; (emotion, enthusiasm, self-denial, self-sacrifice, at the moment, but not clear intelligence and right knowledge of the essential features of the Object to be striven for); and that this was the reason why the atmosphere could not gain permanence, but dispersed in two or three years. Do you think this belief of mine to be right or wrong?

A. It is generally right. A little modification is needed. Our *ṭapasyā* in that time was not sufficient in amount. Had

it been sufficient, we should certainly have achieved the *vidyā*, also. The Lord has said in the *Gītā* that God gives right understanding to the person of firm devotion.

22. Q. I also reverently believe so, but devotion brings such wholesome fruit only when it is rightly directed, when its aim, its object, its ideal, is the Right Object; not otherwise. The *Gītā* says this also: "They who worship other gods, go to the other gods; they who worship *Me* (the Higher Self), come to *Me*." Also: "There is no purifier like unto knowledge." My belief has therefore always been that from the very beginning of *tapasyā* (self-denying effort), right knowledge of the essential features of the true Goal is also absolutely indispensable; otherwise the soul force, the power, of whatever kind, gathered by the *tapasyā*, will certainly err away into wrong paths, as that of Rāvaṇa, etc. Is this belief of mine wrong or right?

A. Entirely right.

23. Q. Just for this very reason have I been endeavouring, from the very beginning of the N.C.O. movement, that side by side with the *tapasyā* of N.C.O., appropriate *vidyā* should be particularly imparted to the people, by the Congress and the leaders, as to the first *essential* of this Intermediate Swa-raj, i.e., Dominion Home Rule, viz., the election of *duly qualified* representatives. Was this wish of mine wrong?

A. If it meant that any *yojanā* (detailed Constitution) should be placed before the people, then I have arrived at the opinion that it would be of no use. But it is quite right and proper that such knowledge should be given to the people, that they should be so awakened, as will make them able to elect duly qualified representatives only. What the qualifications of the representatives should be—I do not like to fix this now. All this should be left to the intelligence of the electors.

24. Q. In respect of the Charkhā, the cultivation of cotton, the storing of yarn, the weaving of cloth, the selling of it, etc., you, yourself and through your co-workers, are constantly giving instruction and information to the people in much detail. Do you not think it necessary to give to the people, similarly, in respect of this very important matter, even some little specific indication as to the marks by which the fitness of representatives might be recognised? Even such self-evident truths, as that two and two make four,

have to be taught to children with much labor. That the charkhā should be worked in leisure hours is also an almost self-evident proposition; yet this also, and with all the labor you have spent on it, is not yet so wide-spread among the people as it ought to be. How then can you leave to the unaided understanding of the electors, the decision of the fitness of representatives, without any instruction and guidance? If you think it undesirable to fix any age-limit, you might give indications in some other respects at least?

A. I have written something in this respect, and write as I find time. But there is no need to speak about it in the Congress. When the people come to the occasion for electing representatives, then advice will have to be given to them about it, as is done now re the charkhā. Every thing has its own fit time.

25. Q. Which of the qualifications suggested by me in No. 2 of my proposals for the Gauhati Congress (appended below) do you think to be desirable, if any at all, for persons to be elected?

A. Almost all, but not for legislative enactment. It is a matter essentially for the education of the electors.

26. Q. I will now ask about another matter. Is it possible to bring about unity and peace between the followers of the several religions without explaining to them that the essentials of all these religions are one and the same? Without showing that the various religions are one at heart, is it possible to make the various religionists one at heart?

A. No.

27. Q. Only when it is explained to the followers of the several religions, that the heart of all religions is the same, will it become possible to make peace between the followers thereof?

A. Yes.

28. Q. What should be done to bring this about?

A. All the good and true followers of the several religions should preach and promulgate this fact.

29. Q. What special effort have you made, or intend to make, in this behalf?

A. I have made enough individual effort; and it continues to be made even today. There is a lack of persons amongst us for this *prachāra* (propaganda); i.e., there are very few persons amongst us who might separate the merits and demerits of the various religions, bring together all the merits, and put them before the people.

30. Q. Do you not think that an influential leader like yourself should bring together into a Committee, selected representatives, large-hearted and broad-minded, of the several religions current in India, who might preach such essential unity of the religions, by speech, writing, and conduct ?

A. I think I have made efforts to the extent of my powers ; but it seems I have not the ability to bring together educated and learned persons for such work. I have therefore contented myself with my own individual efforts.

31. Q. As the time is short, I pass on to another subject. The Hindu Sabha is laying stress on Shuddhi and Sangathan. Can the work of Shuddhi be done effectively without accepting the principle of "class-caste by temperament and function, and not by birth" ? And is the work of Sangathan possible without first abolishing the mutual untouchability which prevails at present, in respect of dining, among the thousands of sub-castes of Hindus ?

A. I have explained my views as regards Shuddhi and Sangathan in *Young India* in the articles I wrote in appreciation of Shradhā-nanda-jī. I am unable to say more. I may say here, however, that even *pankti-bhēda* (separate seat at dinner) is destructive of Sangathan, without a doubt.

32. Q. You have said in *Young India* for 6-1-27 : "Both the Tabligh and the Shuddhi, which is a reply to the former, have to undergo a radical change. Progress of liberal study of religions of the world is bound to revolutionise the existing clumsy method of proselytising which looks to the form rather than the substance. It is the transference of allegiance from one fold to another and the mutual decrying of rival faiths which gives rise to mutual hatred....The third aspect of Shuddhi is conversion properly so-called. And I question its use in this age of growing toleration and enlightenment. I am against conversion, whether it is known as Shuddhi by Hindus, Tabligh by Musalmans, or proselytising by Christians." I most heartily subscribe to all this. In saying it you have completely endorsed the first two objects of the Theosophical Society, which has been working now for fifty-one years, and of which I have been a member for forty-three. But the "growing toleration and enlightenment" are obviously growing very very slowly, and the "liberal study of the religions of the world", which "is bound to revolutionise the existing clumsy methods of proselytising" which seek simply to change the labels and signboards on the 'foreheads' of

persons, has failed to produce its due effect, so far, on the *practice* of the highly educated men who are at the back of these converting movements. Therefore is it not desirable that a great leader like yourself should diligently help to quicken the growth of the toleration and enlightenment and the progress of the liberal study of religions, in more specific and express ways, as suggested in no: 6 of my proposals for the Gauhati Congress, by organising Committees for the purpose, all over the country, to do this vitally important work, which has been rather put aside latterly by the Theosophical Society?

When I asked in my previous question, whether the Principle of "Caste according to character-and-functioning" (*karmanā varṇah*) was not the only legitimate basis as well as completion of Shuddhi, my implication was just this, that if the principle was accepted, the whole of mankind would at once be "converted" to essential Hinduism, without any one having to change his particular religious label or signboard.

A. I can only answer in the words of the seer: "The distant scene I do not care to see, one step enough for me". After all, the future is determined by the sum-total of the present activities, often contradictory, of mankind.

32. Q. You do not, presumably, think it undesirable to form an army of Volunteers for public work in connection with the Congress. If so, do you not think that if the qualifications mentioned in No: 5 (a-b) of my proposals for the Gauhati Congress were prescribed and adopted, the army would become much more efficient? If you consider any particular qualification out of these inappropriate, or any other as more appropriate, would you very kindly mention it?

A. It would be desirable to form such a Corps if it is possible. The qualifications too are good. But my experience shows that we are not in a position to form any such body for all India. It will not come into being by means of resolutions.

(*Note*—After the publication of the above Interview in the *Hindī Aj*, I received a letter from Mahatma-ji, very kindly offering to answer by post any further questions I might send him in writing. But he unfortunately fell ill soon after, and I could not trouble him with further queries. Some obvious ones, arising out of his answers above, will suggest themselves to readers. They may as well be recorded here, to be brought to Mahatma-ji's notice at leisure when he is quite well again,

as he ought to be soon, with the prayers of all India to help him....(The questions are omitted here).

Incidentally, it may be noted that the new Turkish Republic of Angora has by its Constitution, dated 20 April, 1924, fixed 30 years as the minimum age for the Members of its Grand National Assembly (Article 11), and has laid down that "The Council of State shall be composed of persons chosen by the Grand National Assembly, from among those who have held important posts, who possess great experience, and who are specialists, or who are otherwise qualified." Also, the minimum age for membership of the French and the Polish Senates is fixed at 40 years : for the Senate of the U.S.A., 30 ; for the Landsting of Denmark, 35 ; for the Senate of the Czecho-Slovak Republic, 45 years.

Surely, Mahatma-ji cannot have meant that resolutions are of no use ? For, if so, we would not have got the many Non-violent Non-co-operation resolutions, principal and subsidiary, and many others, passed by the Congress ?

Do not such resolutions act as guides and incentives to the public ? It may be that in some conditions of the public mental atmosphere, the resolutions may be ignored by the people ; but even then, is it not desirable to keep the beacon-light burning, the land-marks and the sign-posts clear and high-set, so that, while "none so blind as those who will not see" may go any way they like, yet those who have any wish to open their eyes and see the right path, may not lack guidance ?)

Proposed Resolutions for

The Indian National Congress, Gauhati, 1926.

I. That Swaraj or Self-Government means the Raj of the higher *Swa*, Government by the higher self of the People, *i. e.*, legislation by the wisest, the most experienced, most unselfish and philanthropic men and women of the People, duly chosen and elected by the People ;

II. That the most likely way of finding persons possessed of such qualifications is for the electors to guide themselves by the following considerations, *viz.*,

(a) That the person elected is not less than 40 years of age, for the highest legislative body of the land, and not less than 35 for the lower legislative as well as other elective administrative bodies ;

(b) That he represents either (1) Learning and Art and Science, or (2) Property and Trade and Capital, or (3) Industry and Craft and Labor, or (4) Defensive Power and Military Skill and Executive Ability ;

(c) That he has first-hand experience of one or the other of the above four main broad classes of vocations, has acquired a good reputation in his surroundings for honorable pursuit of the same, is at least literate, and is broad-minded and tolerant in matters of religion ;

(d) That he has independent means of his own ; preference being given, all other qualifications being equal, to one who is no longer engaged in active competitive bread-winning or money-making, but has retired from active profession or business, on a competence, or is assured of all necessities and personal requirements by his family or friends, and has ample leisure for honorary public work ;

(e) That he will be content to receive special honor for his labours in the interests of the public, and will not receive any other remuneration, but all ex-officio expenses of travelling and lodging will be paid to him out of the public funds ;

(f) That he does not canvass for himself directly or indirectly, though if requested by electors, he might publicly signify his consent to bear the burden of public work, if elected.¹

III. That the Outline Scheme of Swaraj published by Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das and Dr. Annie Besant's Commonwealth of India Bill be referred to a special Committee, for full and careful consideration and discussion, as a provisional basis, and for presentation to the All-India Congress Committee, with such modifications, or in such new shape, as they may deem fit ; the rules and methods of election to be especially thought out most carefully, whereby the persons may be discovered, selected, and elected to the various elective bodies, who are physically, intellectually, and even more, *ethically*, fit for public work, and are really philanthropic and unselfish.

IV. (a) That the members of the Congress should guide themselves, as far as possible, from this time onwards, by the recommendations embodied in Resolution II above, in their

¹This proposed resolution II is based on a section, to the same effect, in the Outline Scheme of Swaraj prepared by Deshbandhu C. R. Das and this writer ; (see pp. 254, 295, 352-353 *supra*).

elections for the various subordinate and superordinate bodies of the Congress organisation ; and

(b) That the Indian People generally be requested to guide themselves by the same, in their elections for such bodies as local Taluka and Notified Area and Municipal and District Boards and Committees, etc., (and also the Legislative Councils and Assembly, if the Congress continues to approve of the Swarajist Policy as regards Council entry).

V. (a) That a Congress Army of Volunteers, of half a million men¹, be formed, each member of which shall be possessed of the qualifications, and shall satisfy the conditions, mentioned below, viz.,

He shall be a member of the Congress ; not less than 21 years of age ; possessed of educational qualifications equivalent to the Matriculation, School Leaving Certificate, Pravéshikā, or other corresponding stage, in any of the living languages of India, or Samskr̥t, Persian, Arabic, or English ; shall know Hindustani, i. e. Hindi-Urdu, but this shall not be an indispensable qualification ; shall be thoroughly imbued with the ideal of Swa-raj embodied in Resolution I above ; shall be pledged to non-violence (except as permitted by the Indian Penal Code by way of right of private defence of person and property) ; shall be pledged to service of the Congress, in accordance with the orders of the All-India Congress Committee or its Working Committee, for a period of not less than three and not more than seven years, at a time ; shall be either unmarried, or have retired from the household life, or be otherwise free from responsibility for dependents ; shall not be a bigoted religionist or sectarian, but shall believe that there is a common heart of truth in all the great living religions, though he may believe that his own special religion is the best for himself ; shall be possessed of independent means, or have all the necessities of life and personal requirements supplied to him by either his family or friends, but may receive monies from the funds of the Congress or other public funds, for expenses incurred by him

¹That is, one man out of every three hundred men, of the whole male population of 'British' India. If the male population of 'Indian' India were also recruited from, another hundred thousand would be added. By systematic recruitment, from *every* group of three hundred male persons, living in the neighbourhood of one another, the whole of India would be kept in touch with the Congress.

for Congress work specifically; and shall be capable of doing active work along one or other line of national uplift.

(b) That the Working Committee of the All-India Congress Committee should take steps as soon as possible, to form such a Volunteer Army, and organise it properly, dividing it into groups, for different lines of work, Educational, Protectional, Arbitrational, Industrial, Social, Political, etc., in accord with the temperamental aptitudes and abilities of the volunteers.

(c) That the Congress earnestly appeals to the Indian People to take to their hearts the ideal of Swaraj embodied in Resolution I above, and to advance its realisation by putting into practice in all their elections the recommendations made in Resolution II, and by helping in the formation of this Volunteer Army, for its own service, by dedicating for it one man out of every three hundred of the male population of the country.

VI. (a) That the Congress appeals most earnestly to the Indian People of all creeds generally, to bear in mind constantly that the Supreme Spirit is one and the same in and for all, that the inner essentials of all the great living religions are the same, and that the outer formalities which divide and cause conflicts, when excessively emphasised, are inessential; and it most earnestly and specially appeals to the religious priests and teachers and leaders of all creeds, to help in the realisation of Swaraj, by prominently and persistently drawing the attention of their followers to the Common Uniting Essentials, rather than the Dividing Inessentials.

(b) That the Working Committee of the Congress should form a small Committee of learned, broad-minded, and large-hearted representatives, very carefully selected, of all the great religions (especially, Hinduism, Islam, and Christianity) living side by side today in India, and get prepared, through them, a series of graduated text-books of Universal Religion, *i.e.*, of the Essentials of all these religions, showing, by quotations from the scriptures and writings of all, how these Essentials are common to all of them, underneath the differences of language; and should arrange for the teaching of these text-books in all schools, as far as possible, and the preaching of their contents to the general public, throughout the length and breadth of the land, in the mother-tongues of the various provinces.

VII. That the most urgent need of the hour is co-operation among the People themselves, especially among Congressmen; and the Congress calls upon every Indian to make every effort to check the prevailing universal epidemic of mutual abuse, to promote mutual appreciation, and to contribute whatever he can, in some form or other, for national regeneration.

(Reasons for the Resolutions are omitted. The whole of this book provides them freshly, and much more amply, in the light of subsequent history).

Letters from Mahatma Gandhi.

It gives to this writer, very great pleasure, to be able to conclude this book with the following letters from Mahatma Gandhi, received in kind response to his letters. These latter are also reproduced, to explain the former, with the exception of one, copy of which was not kept, and which is therefore reproduced here in substance, from memory.

If this writer could have had the ability and the good fortune to win Mahatma Gandhi's assent to his proposal, for the appointment of a Committee to draft a Constitution, earlier, e.g., at the 'Interview', reproduced above, or even at a later date, there would perhaps have been no need for him to write scores upon scores of articles in the papers, and, finally, to compile this book. But perhaps it was as well. Such writing, however feebly and faultily done, seems to have had some little effect in making the public think now and then of the very great need for specifying our Goal, our 'Peace Aims,' the kind of Society we want. But it needed the current ghastly War, and the perpetual repetition in the daily press, of the words, 'New World Order', now being uttered by the leaders of *all* the belligerents, to focus public attention on the need to find out *what exactly* was meant by the words; to induce Mahatma Gandhi also to think and speak of the 'New World Order,' (see pp. 325-326, *supra*); and to win his assent to the appointment of a Committee to draft such a 'New Order' for India, for public consideration, discussion, education and formation of Public Opinion, and securing of the united, single-minded, Public Support, from all parties, which is indispensable for Progress and Success.

Since Mahatma-ji has decided to give attention to the subject, this writer feels sure that the whole country will do

the same, and the lack in India's political work will be supplied successfully before long.

In my first letter (copy not kept) to Mahatma-ji, which was written, early in August, 1941, as soon as I was able to sit up in bed and hold a pen, I expressed my deep gratitude to him for the very kind letters of enquiry he had sent to my elder son, Sri Prakasa.¹ I also mentioned to him that Acharya J.B. Kripalani (the present General Secretary of the I.N. Congress) had very kindly come to see me ; that I had spoken to him about the two very fine articles he had contributed to the *Hindustan Times*, in May, 1941, headed, "Victory as War Aim : Frivolous and Cynical Doctrine: *Definition necessary to beat Hitler*"²; that I had asked him whether his arguments did not apply as much to the I.N. Congress as to the British Government, whether definition of the Congress 'war-and-peace-aim' was not as necessary to unite all Indian parties, and to *beat all opponents*, including the British Government, who stood in the way of India's advance to genuine Swa-raj ; and that, Acharya Kripalani, in his usual cheerful way, had only laughed and not given any reply to my query. Finally, in that letter, I prayed Mahatma-ji to very kindly consider the question, and have a Constitution drafted, which would define the Congress' 'War-and-Peace-Aims'. I did not suggest the appointment of a Committee, specifically, in this letter, to the best of my recollection ; probably because I thought that it would be taken as understood, as it was the recognised technique for such work. To this letter, I received the following reply.

¹The U.P. Government very considerably released him from prison, on parole, for 50 days, to look after me. He was finally released, on the expiration of his sentence, of one year, (less remissions, under Jail rules), on 27-10-1941. It has now been decided by the Allahabad High Court, (as was decided earlier by the Punjab High Court), that all convictions and imprisonments of persons who did not actually commit Satyagraha, but only gave notice to the local magistrate that they would, were illegal. Many hundreds of Congressmen have served out the full terms of these 'illegal' sentences ; Sri Prakasa is one of these ; but, of course, *they* have never thought of advancing any such objections of 'technical illegality', and have not offered any defence, at their trials.

²See pp. 462-3, *supra*.

"Sevagram, Wardha, 12-8-1941.

Dear Babu-jee,

It is extraordinary how you have been saved. God's grace. I do hope you will give yourself ample rest.

Your suggestion is not new to me. But who is to frame the future social order? The Congress cannot, in advance, for it is a body whose opinion must change from time to time. If you say I should, I have adumbrated it through the A.I.S.R. (All India Spinners' Association), A.I.V.I.A. (All India Village Industries Association), and the Talimi Sangha. But I would like you not to tax yourself for the time being.

Yours sincerely,
M. K. GANDHI."

"Benares (Cantt.), 17-8-1941.

Revered Mahatma-ji,

I bow to your advice not to tax myself for the present, and will write again more fully when I am somewhat stronger. But I may say now, briefly, in answer to your question, "Who is to frame the future Social Order?", that a Special Committee should be appointed by the W.C. or the A.I.C.C., to prepare a draft of a Constitution for India, embodying a Social Order, which, in the opinion of the Special Committee, would make it reasonably probable that every Indian would have 'necessaries' at least in return for suitable work, and would make the Indian People happier and better off than they are now. This draft would be presented to the W.C. or the A.I.C.C., for such revision and modification as it may deem fit; and, then, would be placed before the public, as a *tentative draft*, embodying what the A.I.C.C. or the W.C. understands as the 'content' of 'Swaraj'. Such action would create, and indicate to the public, solidarity and undivided counsels among the Congress leaders, and would create much greater trust, in the mass-mind, in those leaders. This draft would ultimately be placed by the Congress before the future Constituent Assembly, whenever it happens to meet; and the C. A. would accept, reject, amend, modify it, or substitute it by something entirely different, in short, deal with it, in any way it thinks fit. The (Pt. Motilal) Nehru Committee's draft Scheme of Swaraj, modified and adopted by the All Parties Convention, and then by the Congress, at Calcutta in 1928—affords the needed precedent. Also in a different way, the Fundamental Rights Committee, appointed by the Karachi Congress in 1931. But, most

unfortunately, the Nehru Committee's draft deliberately omitted all treatment of the *Economic Structure* needed by the country, though it was a most important item, as the N. Committee itself expressly said in the Introduction. As to future changes, obviously there is no finality in any human work ; changes of opinion on the part of the Congress would also be published from time to time, for the information of the public ; and, even when a Constitution has been decided on by the first C. A., subsequent C. A.s or Legislatures would make such changes in that Constitution as they think fit. We see such changes being made in the Constitutions of western States, in current history.

With all respect, your sincerely,
"Bhagavan Das."

"Sevagram, Wardha, 27-8-1941.

Dear Baboo-ji,

You have made a concrete and sound suggestion. It can be carried out only when the Working Committee and the A.I.C.C. come out of prison. I hope your progress is steady. You will not allow it to be interrupted by any distraction.

Yours, M.K. Gandhi."

"Benares (Cantt.), 2-10-1941.

Revered Mahatma-ji,

I offer heartfelt thanks to God for giving to our people the opportunity of rejoicing at your entering into the 73rd year to-day ; and we will all pray that there may be many more returns of your birthday, and the People may continue to receive the invaluable inspiration of your tapasyā and soul-force till real Swa-raj is achieved, and thereafter also.

I see, from the papers, that there is a chance that the Working Committee will meet before very long ; as many of the members have come out of prison now, and the rest are expected to do so, shortly, with the exception of dear Jawaharlal¹. I therefore take this opportunity to express the

¹As this is being sent to the press, the papers of 4-12-1941 bring the news that Pt. Jawaharlal and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad have been released, that 3000 other Satyagraha prisoners are being released, that a majority of the detenues (without trial) are also being let go, and that all the remaining

hope that my suggestion, for the appointment of a Committee to prepare a draft of a Constitution for India—which suggestion you very kindly said, in your last letter, was “concrete and sound,” but could “be carried out only when the Working Committee and the A. I. C. C. come out of prison”—may be placed before the Working Committee for consideration when it meets next. I also request permission

prisoners and detenues will be let out soon. It seems that under pressure of Public Opinion in Britain, voiced particularly by Labor, and of the increasing possibility of invasion of Burma and India by Japan, the British Government is trying, very haltingly, to show, in India also, some signs of the ‘English political genius’ of ‘carrying the Opposition in its bosom’; (see pp. 407, 459, 462, *supra*). It has, in the last quarter of 1941, expanded the Viceroy’s Executive Council from seven members to twelve, (including the C-in-C.), and of these, eight are Indians, drawn from ‘public life’, not permanent and regular Government servants. And it has given to this newly constituted Council, the opportunity of ‘constitutionally’ deciding on this step, viz., the release of political prisoners and detenues, in the direction of ‘change of policy’. But, unfortunately, the step is very short and very lame; and the needed ‘change of heart’, which only will bring with it a real ‘change of policy’, is yet in the distance. If the new Council could take up the First Suggestion of this book, (pp. 14, 247), and urge acceptance of it on the British Government, then, it is fairly certain, the Labor Party, and many other influential persons and groups, who may not be formally in that Party, but are sympathetic to India, and recognise the justness of her demand, and also feel the need for a radical change in the relations and proportions, of many sorts, between the several sections, classes, vocations, in Society, generally, in every nation, and between all nations—it is almost certain that all these will strongly support the demand of the Council, and will induce the British Government to accede.

As to how very completely the ‘English political genius’, or the better and truer aspect of Democracy, now carries Opposition in its bosom’, it may be noted that the British Government has begun, since a few years ago, to *pay* a substantial annual salary to the Leader of the Opposition in the Parliament, for *opposing* it, as it pays the Cabinet Ministers more substantial salaries for *supporting* it.

to use publicly some extracts from your two letters of 12th and 28th Aug. 1941, when there is occasion.

I am better than when I wrote last, and can sit at a table and do some work,...for a couple of hours...Since the Great Mystery, 'without whose knowledge and will not a sparrow falls or rises', which equally directs the lives and deaths of such specks of dust as human beings are, and the wheelings of the vast star-systems; since that Great Mystery has thought fit to prolong the life of this particular handful of dust to which my soul is attached, I infer that It wishes that I should continue to work for some time more, at what I have for long felt to be my 'mission in life', viz., to endeavour, in all humility, to the best of my very feeble powers, by such light as is vouchsafed to my dim vision, to endeavour 'to justify the Manu's way to men'.

With all respect, Yours sincerely,
Bhagavan Das."

"Sevagram, 19-10-1941.

Dear Baboo-ji,

I have been long answering your letter. But I am wholly unable to deal with the increasing correspondence from day to day.

I will certainly put the correspondence before the W.C., if it meets before the end of the war.

You may publish the correspondence.

I am glad you are so restored as to be able to handle fairly heavy work. May your powers grow.

Yours sincerely, M.K. Gandhi."

This writer closes the book with repeated expression of his profound gratitude to Mahatma Gandhi for his kindness, and particularly for the benediction with which he ends his last letter, and which this writer takes, with bended head, for himself, personally, and even more for the Object for which he has been working for the last twenty years and more.

Index of Books and Journals.

- Agra-gāmī, (daily, of Benares), 337.
 Ain-i-Akbari, by Abul Fazl, 332, 485.
 Aj, (daily, of Benares), 355, 518, 526.
 Ancient vs. Modern Scientific Socialism, by Dr. Bhagavan Das. (See Socialism).
 Apology for Mohamed, by G. Higgins, 213.
 Aryan Path, The, (monthly, of Bombay), 333.
 Assassins, History of the, by J. Von Hammer, 211.
 Awakening of India, The, by Ramsay Macdonald, 81.
 Autobiography, by Freud, 134.
 Between Two Wars, by K. Zilliacus, 27-8, 101-2, 108, 114, 157-169.
 Bhagavad-Gītā, 196, 222, 232, 485.
 Bhāgavata, 153. Bible, xii, 506-8.
 Blackmail or War, by Mme. Tabouis, 108.
 Blue Book, The Government, 102.
 Bombay Chronicle, (daily), 366.
 Boston Herald (of Boston, U.S.A.), 41.
 British Case, The, 454.
 Case for Federal Union, The. (See Federal Union).
 Changing World, The, by Annie Besant, 400.
 Chicago Times, The, 365.
 Chicago Tribune, The, 365.
 Civilisation and its Discontents, by Freud, 134.
 Communalism and Its Cure by Theosophy, by Dr. Bhagavan Das, 184, 315.
 Crux in Political Science and Art, The/ Ethico-Psychological, by Dr. Bhagavan Das, 60, 243, 285, 352, 467.
 Daily Herald, (of Britain), 24, 25.
 Daily Worker, The, (of Britain), 24, 416.
 Declaration of Rights, The, by H.G. Wells, 471-4.
 Declaration of Duties, The, by Dr. Bhagavan Das, 475.
 Dream We Lost, The, by F. Uteley, 500.
 Durgā-Sapta-Shati, 10.
 Eastern Religions and Western Thought, by Sir S. Radhakrishnan, 5, 70, 382.
 Essential Unity of All Religions, The, by Dr. Bhagavan Das, 77, 129, 134, 195, 205, 285, 404, 437, 480, 517.
 Ethico-Psychological Crux in Political Science and Art, The. See Crux.
 Fate of Homo Sapiens, by H.G. Wells, 452.
 Federal Union, The Case for, by W.B. Curry, 22, 42, 47, 72, 78, 105, 170.
 Future of an Illusion, The, by Freud, 134.
 Germany and England, by Prof. Cramb, 87, 88, 113, 120-1, 124-5, 136-8, 140, 142-3.
 Gītā, See Bhagavad-Gītā.
 Great Design, The, 441.
 Guide through World Chaos, by G.D.H. Cole, 409.
 Guide to Socialism, by G.B. Shaw. (See Socialism).
 Guild State, The, by G.R.S. Taylor, 409.
 Guild System as a substitute for Trade Unionism, The, by Annie Besant, 409.
 Harijan, The, (Mahatma Gandhi's weekly), xxiii, 277, 281, 283, 302.
 Harper's Magazine (U.S.A.), 365, 392.
 Hindu, The, 299.
 Hindusthan Standard (daily, of Calcutta), 340.
 Hindustan Times, The, (daily, of New Delhi), 14, 34, 49, 91, 111, 112, 143, 153, 180-3, 195, 277, 279, 293, 311, 318, 321, 327, 334, 337, 348, 363-5, 386, 444, 455, 503, 511-3.
 Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule, by Mahatma Gandhi, 333, 508.
 Hero as King, The, by Carlyle, 156.
 History of Human Marriage, by Westermarck, 486.

- History of the Congress, The, by Dr. B. Pattabhi Sittaramayyah, 131.
 History of Our Times, by Rosa Nichols, 352.
 History of the Russian Revolution, by Trotsky, 392.
 Hitler's War, Before and After, by Hugh Dalton, M. P., 20, 44, 46, 118-119.
 Hitopadesha, 147, 161.
 How Came Civilisation, by Lord Raglan, 74.
 Human Affairs, by Cattell, 515.
 Idiot's Delight, by R. Sherwood, 112.
 Impressions and Comments, by Havelock Ellis, 450.
 India, the Awakening of, by Ramray Macdonald, 81.
 India, The Oxford History of, by V. A. Smith, 252.
 India and Democracy, by Sir G. Schuster and Gny Wint, 316.
 Inside Europe, by John Gunther, 101.
 Isis Unveiled, by H. P. Blavatsky, 72.
 Kama-Shastra, 465.
 Krishna, A Study in the Theory of Avatars, by Dr. Bhagavan Das, 127.
 Labour in the War, by John Price, 401, 416.
 Leader, (daily, of Allahabad), xii, 1, 83, 168, 185, 220, 221, 248, 325, 337.
 Letter to Jan Styka, by Tolstoy, 332.
 Liberty in the Modern State, by H. Laski, 53, 56, 62, 66, 390, 408, 417, 422-429.
 Liberty and Democratic Leadership, 401.
 Liberty, On, by J. S. Mill, 388.
 Liberty Today, by C. E. M. Joad, 43, 64, 82, 95, 97, 129, 390-408.
 Little Essays of Love and Virtue, by Havelock Ellis, 465.
 Look, The, (of U.S.A.), 365.
 Mahā-bhārata, xii, 147, 200, 390, 508.
 Mahatma Letters, The, 8, 96.
 Mahatma, The, (weekly, of Poona), 81, 201, 316, 449.
 Man, The Unknown, by Alexis Carrel, 439.
 Manchester Guardian, (of Britain), 24, 25, 45, 299, 318.
 Manava-Dharma-Sūtra, 176.
 Manu, Laws of, 196, 437-8.
 Mein Kampf, by Hitler, 106, 129, 238, 506-7, 511.
 Memo: of Information, 506, 511.
 Modern Democracies, by Bryce, 218, 351.
 More Essays of Love and Virtue, by Havelock Ellis, 465, 487.
 Must the War Spread, by Pritt, 108.
 Mutual Aid, by Prince Kropotkin, 125, 440.
 My Afternoon Journey, by Winston Churchill, 362.
 Nation, The, (of New York), 337, 451.
 National Government, A, Answers to Criticisms, 296.
 National Herald, The, (of Lucknow) 21, 27, 32, 34, 35, 102, 292, 317, 364-7, 415, 493.
 New India Survey, (Dr. G. S. Arundale's weekly, of Madras), 112, 197, 348.
 New Republic, (of New York), 337.
 News Chronicle, (of Britain), 24, 499.
 New Statesman and Nation, (of Britain), 24, 220, 247.
 New World Order, A, by H. G. Wells, 41, 461.
 New York Daily Mirror, The, 365.
 New York Herald Tribune, 365.
 New York Sun, The, 365.
 New York Times, The, 365.
 New York World Telegrams, The, 365.
 On Liberty, by J. S. Mill, 388.
 Ourselves and Germany, by the Marquess of Londonderry, 100, 107, 148.
 Outline of History, by H. G. Wells, 43, 73, 142, 396, 405-6, 469, 470.
 Pancha-Tantra, 147, 161, 290.
 Pathology of Princes, The, by K. L. Ganbn, 386.
 Pelican Series, The, 391.
 People, The, (of Britain) 361.
 Picture Post, (of London), 41, 45, 451.
 Pravda, (of Russia), 392.
 Preaching of Islam, The, by Sir T. W. Arnold, 219.
 Proceedings, of the Non-Party Political Conference, 296, 307.
 Property and Improperly, by J. A. Hobson, 158.
 Psychology of Philosophers, The, by A. Herzberg, 185..

- Psychology of Sex, by H. Ellis, 465.
 Purāṇas, The, 73, 240.
 Qurān, 508.
 Rāmāyana, ix.
 Reader's Digest, (of New York), 19, 239, 245, 392, 499, 514.
 Realities of War, The, by Philip, Gibbs, 162, 354.
 Religions, The Essential Unity of All, (See Essential Unity)
 Representative Government, by Henry Ford, 243, 467.
 Reynolds' News, 24, 322, 479.
 Rg-Vēda, xii.
 Rights of Man, The, or What are we fighting for?, by H.G. Wells, 41, 162.
 Roads to Freedom, by Bertrand Russell, 409, 464-5.
 Roving Commission, A, by Mr. Winston Churchill, 367.
 Russia in the Shadows, by H. G. Wells, 453.
 Sanātana-Dharma, The Advanced Text-Book of, 190.
 School for Barbarians, by Erika Mann, 78.
 Science of Peace, The, by Dr. Bhagavan Das, 65, 296, 408, 484.
 Science of Social Organisation or The Laws of Mann, by Dr. Bhagvan Das, 77, 146, 168, 285, 405, 480, 485.
 Science of The Emotions, The, by Dr. Bhagavan Das, 96, 141, 290, 489.
 Science of The Self, The, by Dr. Bhagavan Das, 62, 134, 232, 485, 489.
 Secret Doctrine, The, by H. P. Blavatsky, 72, 73.
 Shape of Things to Come, The, by H. G. Wells, 41, 404.
 Shastra-s, 253.
 Shorty History of the World, A, by H. G. Wells, 405.
 Smṛti-s, 241, 242.
 Social Environment and Moral Progress, by A. R. Wallace, O. M., 138.
 Socialism, Ancient vs. Modern Scientific, by Dr. Bhagavan Das, 58, 285, 409, 464, 485.
 Socialism, The Intelligent Woman's Guide to, by G. B. Shaw, 157, 243.
 Sorrows of Satan, The, by Marie Corelli, 390.
 Stalin and Hitler, by Louis Fischer, 108, 111, 114.
 Statesman, (of Calcutta), 36, 37, 55, 84, 105, 110, 128, 162, 317, 331, 336, 478, 513.
 Stories, Essays, etc., by Aldous Huxley, 168.
 Study of Sociology, by Herbert Spencer, 217.
 Swa-raj, Outline Scheme of, by Deshbandhu O. R. Das and Bhagavan Das, 14, 254, 295, 528.
 Theosophist, The (monthly, of Adyar, Madras) 361.
 Theosophy in Action, (quarterly of Britain), 70.
 Thinkers' Library, 391.
 Times, (of London) 41, 318, 320-1, 323, 504-5, 513.
 Travels of a Radical in Search of Hot Water, by H. G. Wells, 43, 79, 343.
 Tribune, (of London), 24, 81.
 Uncle S(h)am, by K. L. Gauba, 386.
 Upanishats, 508.
 Unser Kampf, (Our Struggle), by Sir R. Acland, 3, 16, 33, 77.
 Vaishēshika-Sūtra-s, 146.
 We Europeans, by J. S. Huxley and others, 98.
 Week, The, (of Britain) 416.
 Weekly Notes, by Dr. G.S. Arundale, (of Madras), 112.
 What are we to do with our Lives ?, by H. G. Wells, 452, 464, 468, 470, 483.
 What are you going to do ?, by Aldous Huxley, 125.
 What Hitler Wants, by E. O. Lorimer, 97, 238, 240.
 World Dominion or Downfall, by Bernhardi, 86.
 World Fellowship, 9, 69.
 Young India, (weekly of Mahatma Gandhi), 185, 188, 352-3, 525.

Index of Proper Names.

- Abdnl Ghaffar Khan, Khan, ('Frontier Gandhi'), 181, 195, 219, 341.
 Abdur Rashid Chaudhuri, Maulvi, 372.
 Abel, 11.
 Abul Fazl, 222, 332, 485.
 Abnl Fazl, Mirza, 213.
 Abul Kalam Azad, Maulana, 177, 253, 332, 350, 377, 534.
 Achilles, 348.
 Acland, Sir Richard, xiv, 3, 16, 33, 77, 155, 156.
 Adlor, Alfred, 484.
 Ađi-Mauu, 212.
 Agha Khan, 301.
 Ahriman, 347.
 Ajmal Khan, Hakim, 210, 253.
 Akbar, 29.
 Alexander, 142, 423.
 Alla Baksh, Khan Bahadur, 219, 316, 364.
 Alauddin Gheri, 96.
 Al-Ghaffar, 511.
 Al-Qabbâr, 511.
 Amanulla, (late King of Afghanistan), 191.
 Ambedkar, Dr. B.R., 298, 345.
 Amery, Mr., 81, 83, 111, 112, 113, 248, 250, 255, 256, 279, 310, 337, 363, 365, 372, 421, 505.
 Amrit Lal Ojha, Shri, 311.
 Anchises, 120.
 Aney, M.S., Shri, 295, 298, 326.
 Anghra-Mainyu, 347.
 Aravinda (Anrobindo) Ghesh, Shri, 184.
 Archbishops, of Canterbury, York, and Westminster, 6.
 Arnold, Sir T.W., 213.
 Arundale, Dr. G.S., 112, 197, 348.
 Asaf Behari, M., 180.
 Ashoka, 29.
 Attlee, O.R., (Lord Privy Seal, Major) 34, 35, 293, 358-9, 363.
 Auchinleck, General, 291, 500.
 Azazel, 206, 390.
 Bakunin, 435.
 Baldwin, Mr. (later Earl), 161, 170, 496, 498.
 Balwant Singh, Sirdar, 299.
 Banse, Prof., 97.
 Bayor, Mr. Jerome, 365.
 Becker, Mr. Ernest A., 417, 419.
 Begam Shah Nowaz, 317.
 Bones, President, 26.
 Bentham, 435.
 Bernhardt, General, 54, 86, 87, 325.
 Bernal, Prof. J.D., 445, 446.
 Besant, Dr. (Mrs.) Annie, 14, 36, 93, 113, 184, 190, 409, 480.
 Bevan, Mr. Anenrin, M.P., 367.
 Bevin, Ernest, 35, 45, 416.
 Bhulabhai Desai, Shri, 50, 378.
 Bhupendra Nath Basu, 277.
 Bismarck, Prince, 89.
 Blavatsky, H. P., 85, 72, 113.
 Betticher, Prof. 120.
 Bradlangh, 195.
 Bradley, Prof. A. C., 87.
 Brailsford, Mr. H. N., 479-80.
 Brahma, 346.
 Brittain, Vera, 38.
 Brooksley, Col., 91.
 Bryce, Viscount, 243, 352.
 Buddha, 177, 187, 305.
 Buell, Mr. Harold, 417.
 Burdwan, Maharajadhiraj of, 298, 306, 310.
 Burns, 512.
 Caen, 11.
 Caesar, 142.
 Cattell, Dr. R. B., 515.
 Carlyle, 156.
 Carrel, Alexis, 439.
 Carr-Saunders, A. M., 98.
 Carr, Sir H., 301.
 Castlereagh, Viscount, 148.
 Chamberlain, Mr. Neville, xix, 20, 26, 27.
 Chāṇakya *alias* Vishnu Sharma, 147.
 Chandavarkar, Mr. V. D., 298.
 Charles I, 242.
 Chekov, 425.
 Chiang Kai Shek, Marshal, 160, 357,

507.
 Ohinoy, Sir Sultan, 298, 307.
 Christ, 3, 77, 177, 187, 256, 305, 331, 396.
 Ohurohill, the Right Hon'ble Mr. Winston, xix, 32, 35, 38, 42, 43, 42, 43, 54, 82, 85, 86, 104, 114, 117, 148, 155, 255, 293, 310, 321, 337, 362-7 370-1, 404, 416, 417, 445-8, 480, 502-3.
 Choate, Hon. Joseph, 87.
 Clemenceau, M. 103, 104.,
 Clough, Arthur Hugh, x.
 Cole, G. D. H., 409.
 Cooper, Mr. Duff, 164, 358, 366, 373.
 Crelli, Marie, 390.
 Courroy, Kenneth de, 506.
 Cramb, Prof. 87, 89, 113, 115, 119, 120-128, 131-137, 139-143.
 Jonfuious, 187.
 Cromwell, Oliver, ix, 401, 408.
 Curry, W. B., xiv, 20-22, 27, 42, 46, 72, 78, 104, 105, 128, 156, 170,
 Daladier, M., xix, 110, 240.
 Dalal, Sir A.B., 298.
 Dalton, Mr. Hugh, M.P., 20, 44, 254, 274, 295, 352.
 Dalvi, D. G., 299.
 Daud Khan, 252.
 Darbhanga, Han'ble Sir Kamesh-
 vara Singh, Maharajahdiraj, of
 309.
 Darwin, 154, 435.
 Das, Deshbandhu C. R., 14, 254, 274, 295, 352, 528.
 Dayananda, Swāmī, 183, 210.
 Delisle, Dr. A. L., 9.
 Dewey, Prof., 405.
 D. 516.
 Anthony, 109, 161, 162, 446-7.
 Edward VIII, (late King-Emperor of Britain, now Duke of Windsor), 242.
 Ellis, Havelock, 465, 484, 487.
 Emerson, 165, 290, 331-2.
 332, 435, 444.

 Fazlul Haq, 219, 316, 317.
 Fielden, Mr. Lionel, 417.
 Fischer, Louis, 108, 109, 110, 111, 114, 448.
 Ford, Henry, (author, not the motor-
 car manufacturer), 243, 467.
 Franck, Dr., 129.
 Frankenstein, 438.
 Frederick the Great, 124, 125, 127.
 Freud, 133-135.
 Frick, 97.
 Fritz, 425.
 Gallup, 500.
 Galton, 516.
 Gandhi, Mahatma, xx-ii, 13, 59, 60, 84, 93, 97, 113, 117, 141, 185, 186, 188, 190, 193-195, 204, 210, 213, 218, 224, 248-251, 253-255, 264-265, 267, 269, 273-284, 286, 288-290, 292, 294-296, 298, 302, 305, 311, 312, 317, 325-6, 331-342, 346, 348-357, 371, 374-5, 377, 396, 399, 414, 419-421, 465, 494, 508, 518-9, 526, 531-4, 536.
 Gandhi, Frontier. (See Abdul Ghaffar Khan).
 Ganesh Shankar Vidyārthi, 288.
 Ganpat Sahai, 299.
 Gauba, K. L., 386.
 Gauch, 97.
 Gauri-Kali, 160, 511.
 George VI, King, 111, 242.
 George, Lloyd, 24, 27, 34, 42, 101, 103, 104, 132, 321, 425, 446.
 Gessell, Silvio, 516.
 Gibbs, Philip, 162, 354.
 Gibson, George, 111, 113.
 Gideon, Mr., G. S., 370.
 Goebels, 97.
 Goering, 100.
 Gokhale, G. K., 197.
 Gokul Chand Narang, Sir, 193.
 Grady, Dr. Henry, 321-2.
 Greenwood, Mr. Arthur, 34, 35.
 Gregory, Sir Richard, 444, 446.
 Gulab Singh, Maharaja, of Kashmir, and Jammu, 104.
 Gunther, John, 44, 101.
 Gwynn, Mr. 318.
 Habib-ur-Rahman, Syed, 179.
 Haddon, A. C., 98.
 Hafiz, 139.
 Haig, Field-Marshal Lord, 8.
 Haksar, Sir K. N., 298.
 Halifax, Lord, 114, 115, 153, 155, 369, 370-2, 503.
 Hamilton, Sir Ian, 8, 84.
 Hammer, J. Von, 211.

- Hansraj, Mahatma, 252.
 Hard, William, 245.
 Hardinge, Lord, 84.
 Hegel, 40, 121, 435.
 Henderson, Sir Nevile, 72, 82, 102, 107.
 Herod, 97.
 Herzberg, A., 185.
 Hess, Rudolf, 291.
 Hideyoshi, 518.
 Higgins, G., 218.
 Hiranya-Kashipu, 846.
 Hitler, Adolf, xix, 16, 20, 84, 42, 45, 54, 78, 82, 84-86, 92, 97, 99, 100, 102-103, 105, 109, 118, 116, 129, 148, 158, 166, 168, 172, 192, 218, 231, 238-239, 241-242, 246, 248, 291, 359, 369, 370-1, 479, 498, 500-1, 506-7, 509, 511-2, 532.
 Hoare, Sir Samuel, 88, 101, 301.
 Hobson, J. A., 158.
 Hodson, Mr., 816, 177.
 Ho-Lung, 425.
 Horder, Lord, 329.
 Huxley, Aldous, 125, 168, 484.
 Huxley, Julian S., 98.
 Hyde, 160, 509.
 Irwin, Lord 114, 115, 153, 155, 369, 370, '1, '2. (See Halifax).
 Iyeyasu, 518.
 Jacques, 425.
 Jagdish Prasad, Sir, 297, 302, 303, 304, 307, 310.
 Jaiprakash Narain, 419-422.
 James, William, 411.
 Janns, 160, 509, 512.
 Jawahar Lal Nehru, Pandit, xxi, 50, 94, 176, 274, 277, 278, 279, 283, 301, 317, 323-4, 326-7, 329-332, 336-7, 339, 353, 375, 377, 534.
 Jayakar, Right Hon'ble Mr. M. R., 300, 315.
 Jehangir, Sir Cowasjee, 298.
 Jekyll-Hyde, 160, 509.
 Jesus, 3, 77, 177.
 Jinnah, Mr. M.A., 18, 33, 180, 219-221, 311-312, 316-318, 375.
 Jones, 425.
 Jogendra Singh, Sir, 298, 304.
 Joad, C. E. M., Prof., 43, 63, 82, 95, 97, 99, 129, 390-1, 394-6, 399, 401-8, 410, 429.
 Kâli, 160, 511.
 Kamal Atatürk, 191, 507.
 Kamala-devi Chattopadhyaya, Mrs., 366.
 Kanrvas, 508.
 Key, Ellen, 516.
 Khan, Dr., 187, 219, 220.
 Kilpatrick, Prof., 405.
 King, Mackenzie, 46.
 Kipling, Rudyard, xii.
 Kitchener, Lord, 8, 9, 44, 97, 165.
 Knox, Sir Alfred, 505.
 Kripalani, Acharya J.B., 538.
 Krishnamachari, T. T., 299.
 Kropotkin, Prince, 125.
 Krishna, 37, 149, 150, 187, 390, 508.
 Kumiřila, 208.
 Kunzru, Pt Hriday Nath, 299.
 Kno, Mr. P. W., 445.
 Kuroki, 425.
 Lajpat Rai, Lala, 184, 274.
 Lansbury, George, 14.
 Laski, Prof. H., 58, 56, 62-63, 65, 81, 99, 387, 363, 390-1, 408, 410-1, 415-6, 416-417, 423, 425, 429.
 Lenin, 114, 332, 393, 435, 506-7.
 Lincoln, Abraham, 284, 351, 353, 402.
 Linlithgow, Lord, 3-4, 18, 22, 26, 28, 81, 220, 281, 296, 310, 316.
 Lindbergh, Col., 49.
 Litvinoff, M., 47, 322-3.
 Liverpool, Earl of, 148.
 Lloyd George, 24, 27, 84, 42, 101, 103, 104, 132, 321, 425, 446.
 Louis XVI, King, 242.
 Londonderry, Marquess of, 100, 107, 148, 161.
 Loreburn, Lord, 123.
 Lorimer, E. O., 95, 97, 115, 238, 240.
 Lothian, Lord, 114, 502.
 Lovell, 388.
 Lowell, James Russell, x.
 M. P.'s, Nine, 31, 372.
 Macdonald, Mr. Ramsay, 47, 81, 117, 325.
 Maffey, 102.
 Maqbul Haq, Maulana, 180.
 Maharaj Singh, Sir, 299, 304.
 Maheshwar Dayal Seth, Raja, 299.
 Mahmud of Ghazni, 96.
 Maisky, Mr. 322-3, 447-8, 506.
 Mandana, 208.
 Mander, Mr., M. P., 42.
 Mann, Erika, 78.
 Mann, Tom, 394.

Mann, 35, 51, 211, 289, 406, 435.
 Marx, 40, 114, 332, 435, 444, 465, 474, 507, 519.
 Matsuka, Mr., 143, 153.
 McGovern, Mr., 358
 Mehra, Chunnilal B., 298.
 Michael, 347.
 Milch, General, 86.
 Mill, J. S., 391, 435.
 Minto, Lord, 184, 198, 315.
 Mitha, Sir Suleman Cassim, 293.
 Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council 6.
 Mohamed Ali Maulana, 155, 235.
 Mohammad Mian, Maulana, 178.
 Molesworth, General, 165.
 Monroe, 143.
 Mooney, Tom, 394.
 Moonje, Dr. B.S., 176, 299, 305, 311.
 Moonye, Archbishop, 503.
 Moore, Mr. W. A., 36, 478-9.
 Morley, Lord John, 184, 198, 315.
 Morrison, Mr. H., 416.
 Moses, 177, 187.
 Montesquieu, 143.
 Montague, Mr., 322.
 Montessori, Dr. Maria, 405.
 Muhammad, 177, 187.
 Muhammad Tughlaq, 234.
 Munshi, Mr. K.L., 316, 477.
 Munshi Ram. Lala, 274.
 Mussolini, Benito, xix, 42-43, 64, 83-84, 87, 98, 102, 131, 148, 168, 192, 242, 388, 507.
 Myers, Dr. C.S., 405.
 Napoleon, 110, 142, 243, 291, 500.
 Nara-Simha, 346.
 Nārada, 390
 Narayana, 147,
 Natesan, G.A., Mr., 298,
 Nehru, Pt. Jawaharlal (See Jawahar Lal)
 Nehru, Pt. Motilal, 274, 295, 414.
 Nichols, Ross, 352.
 Nicholson, Field-Marshal Sir W., 185.
 Nietzsche, 87, 119, 120, 128, 136, 141.
 Nogi, Marshal, 387.
 Oates, Capt., 140, 141.
 Odin, 88.
 Ormuzd, 347.
 Pāndavas, 508.
 Paine, Thomas, 402.
 Paranjpye, Dr. R.P., 297.

Parlakimedi, Maharaja of, 233.
 Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Dr. B., 184.
 Pestalozzi, 405.
 Petain, Marshal, xix, 85.
 Pinkevich, Prof., 405.
 Plato, 423.
 Polak, H.L.S., 275.
 Pole, David Graham, 14.
 Pope, The, 6 9.
 Prabhavati, Mrs. Jaiprakash Narain, 419.
 Prahlada, 356.
 Price, John, 401, 416.
 Pritt, Dr. K.L., M.P., 108, 109, 448.
 Purushottam Das Tandon, Shri, 355.
 Radhakrishnan, Sir S., 4, 7, 70, 332.
 Raglan, Lord, 74.
 Rahimtoola, Mr. Fazal Ibrahim, 297, 306.
 Rajagopalachari, Shri C., 274, 277, 282, 331, 334, 348, 350, 377.
 Raj Narayana Sharma, 252.
 Rāma, 29, 187, 302, 398, 425, 508.
 Rāvana, 398, 508.
 Ray, Acharya Sir, P. C., 252.
 Reade, Winwood, 382.
 Reed, Sir Stanley, 365.
 Reza Shah Pahlevi, (late king, of Persia), 191, 507.
 Robertson, Field-Marshal Sir W., 9.
 Roosevelt, Franklin D., President of the U.S.A., xix, 19, 54, 82, 86, 237-239, 241, 243-245, 321, 363, 373, 402, 446, 498, 511-2.
 Rousseau, 435.
 Rudra, (See Shiva).
 Rudyard Kipling, xii.
 Rūm, Maulana, 228.
 Russell, Bertrand, 43, 78, 405, 409, 465, 469, 484.
 Sacco, 394.
 Sā'dī, Sheikh, ix, xiii, 198.
 Sādulla, Sir M., 316.
 Salter, Sir Arthur, 78.
 Saud, (king of Arabia), 191,
 Sankey, Lord, 45, 472.
 Sant Singh, Sirdar, 299, 306, 309.
 Sapru, Sir Tej Bahadur, 296, 297, 307, 310.
 Sarojini Naidu, Mrs., 93.
 Satan, 206, 347, 390.
 Satyamurti, Shri S., 51, 294.
 Savarkar, Shri Vinayak Damodar, 176, 210, 299, 305, 311.

Shankar-ābharya, of Shringeri, 252.
 Shankara, 208.
 Shankat Ali, Maulana, 227, 235.
 Shaw, G.B., 47, 156, 158, 248, 484.
 Sherwood, Robert, 112.
 Shiva Prasad Gnpta, Shri, 352, 518.
 Shiva-Rudra, 160, 346, 511.
 Shiva Rao, Shri, 299.
 Shraddhānanda, Swami, 210, 211, 274, 525.
 Shyama Prasad Mnkorjee, Dr., 176, 193, 201, 230, 299, 307, 311.
 Sikandar Hyat Khan, Sir, 174, 219, 316, 364-5.
 Sikandar Shah, Sultan, 252.
 Sinnett, A. P. 36.
 Simon, Sir John, 160.
 Sisyphus, 347.
 Sitalvad, Sir Ohimanlal, 299.
 Sircar, Sir Nripendra Nath, 297, 299, 307, 310, 312.
 Smith, V.A., 252.
 Smut, General, (now Field-Marshal) 230, 231.
 Snell, Henry, 14.
 Spencer, Herbert, 154, 217, 405, 485.
 Spender, Mr., 38.
 Spenta-Mainyn, 347.
 Sri Prakasa, 386, 532.
 Stalin, xix, 82, 148, 168, 192, 242, 291, 373, 506-7.
 Stewart, Capt. Balfour, 40.
 Sultan Ahmad, Sir, 317.
 Sunda, 347.
 Sunderishan, Mr., 372.
 Sun Yat Sen, Dr., 356-7, 507.
 Tabouis, Madame, 44, 108.
 Tacitus, 89.
 Tai Chi Tao, H. E., 341.
 Tantalus, 347.
 Taylor, G.R.S., 409.
 Tennyson, xi.

Thoreau, 331-2.
 Thucydides, 89.
 Tilak, Lokamanya Bal Gangadhar, 184, 210, 274, 295.
 Tilottamā, 347.
 Tolstoi, 141, 331-2.
 Trietschke, 87, 119, 148.
 Trotsky, 192, 392.
 Upa-sunda, 347.
 Upādhyāy, S., 348.
 Utley, Miss Freda, 497, 502-3.
 Vālmiki, ix.
 Vanzetti, 394.
 Vijaya Anand, Maharaj-Kumar Sir, of Vizianagram, 310.
 Virgil, 120, 121, 122.
 Vishnu, 346.
 Vishnu Sharma, (See Chānakya).
 Vitthalbhai Patel, 274.
 Voltaire, 485.
 Wallace, A.R., O.M., 138, 154, 485.
 Wavell, General, Sir Archibald, 83, 500.
 Wells, H. G., xii, 40, 45, 73, 79, 142, 146, 156, 158, 162, 325, 342-3, 371, 383-4, 396-8, 405-6, 408-9, 429-431, 465-471, 483-4.
 Westermarck, 486.
 Wilhelm, Kaiser, 54.
 Wilson, President, 104, xii, 132, 218, 243, 397.
 Wint, Guy, 317.
 Winterton Lord, 41, 42.
 Younghusband, Sir Francois, 69, 70, 504-5.
 Yndishkithira, 20, 29, 149, 150.
 Zafrulla Khan, Sir M., 377-8.
 Zetland, Marquis of, 70.
 Zilliacens, K., 27, 28, 101, 114, 157, 160, 167, 168, 169, 170, 401, 407, 416.
 Zoroaster, 187.

APOSW

BANASTHALI VIDYAPITH
CENTRAL LIBRARY



आज

A Quarterly News Bulletin of A.P.S.

Professor A.D.N. Bajpai **University, Rewa, 486003, M.P. India**

Vice-Chancellor

A.P.S. University

Rewa-486003, M.P.



Sign 242475, 951952 (B)
Email: adnbajpai@yahoo.com

vcapsu@lycos.com

28-4-2004

MESSAGE

The word 'university', as we all know, is derived from the word 'universe'. It clearly denotes a culture, and a mind set that is holistic and universal in nature. Anything that is narrow, limited, selfish and short term cannot belong to a university. The biggest challenge before Indian universities and their academics in particular is to rise above the personal, the local, and the biased.

Like universities, the components, elements, streams, forces and pressures within a university are often contradictory, and several in nature. A newsletter of a university is

Chief Minister, in her impressive address talked about the aims of education. She presented a detailed plan on how gradually eradicate poverty and unemployment from the state. She particularly emphasized on the empowerment of women.

Addressing the large gathering, Prof. A.D. N. Bajpai reiterated his mission to bring about quality in education. He underlined the need to crush unethical practices that have crept in the university system.

Apart from the large number of eager listeners, the professors, teachers, officers, students and employees the university attended the function. The M.L.A.s of the region and members of the Executive Council were also present. Prof. Ajay Awasthi conducted the function. Prof. C.D. Singh gave vote of thanks and Dr. Dinesh Kushwal read the adulation note. Dr. Atul Pandey, Coordinator MBA Dept managed the show.

Editor's Note